A 3 HJ Johnston J.871

A VINDICATION OF THE BISHOP of *CONDOM*'s EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE Catholic Church.

In Answer to a Book Entituled,

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, *&c.*

With a Letter from the said Bishop.

Permissu Superiorum.

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, for His Household and Chappel. 1686.

A VINDICATION OF THE *EXPOSITION* of the *DOCTRINE* OF THE Catholic Church.

PART I.

Containing an Anſwer to the Preface.

IT is no leſs ſtrange, than much to be deplored that Religion, which ought to be the Common Band of Unity, ſhould, by the ſubtilty of Satan, become the Occaſion of Diſcord and Contention amongſt Chriſtians: And that all the Methods which the Catholic Church makes uſe of, or the Means her dutiful Children can ſuggeſt, ſhould be ſo far from opening the Eyes of many, otherwiſe clear-ſighted and well-meaning Perſons, led away with the Prejudice of Education; as to give them occaſion to calumniate her Do-

ctrines, cenſure her Practices, and condemn her Paſtors.

One would have thought, ſuch a Book as is the Biſhop of *Condom's* Expoſition, free from Paſſion, grounded upon the Pure Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and ſeconded by the greateſt Authority in the Church next to that of the Council it ſelf, ſhould have calm'd the Minds of them, who pretend to be lovers of Peace and Unity, and have made thoſe, who propoſe to themſelves any thing of ſincerity in matters of ſuch high concerns, to acknowledge the Doctrines of the Catholic Church to have been faithfully Expounded in it.

But we ſee the contrary, and that a Book thus grounded upon the manifeſt Doctrine of a General Council, approv'd as ſuch by the Learned Prelates of divers Nations, and by the Pope himſelf, muſt be made to paſs amongſt our New Reformers as a Book which *Palliates* or *Prevaricates* the Doctrine of our Church; and the very Approbations as *meer Artifices to deceive* the World, and not as *Sincere, much leſs Authoritative Approbations either of the Nature or Principles* of the ſame Doctrine.

Pref. p. 15.

Had the Author indeed of this Calumny, who pretends to lay down the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, given us ſome more Authentic Teſtimonies for what he Publiſhes; or taught us ſome better Method, whereby to know the Doctrine of a Church, he might have had a more plauſible appearance of Reaſon to complain: But when we ſee him giving us the Doctrines of his Church upon no better Teſtimony than his own, and that of an *Imprimatur*; when we ſee him to be ſo far from fixing himſelf to the known Doctrine of the Church of *England*

land exhibited in her Canons, and Thirty nine Articles, that in ſeveral places he aſſerts what is not to be found amongſt them; and when we hear him telling us, he has *forborn to ſet his Name to it, leaſt perhaps any prejudice againſt his Perſon might chance to injure the Excellence of the Cauſe which he maintains*; I cannot without ſome wonder reflect upon his Cenſure, and the Reception his Book is ſaid to have had. But it ſeems for him to tell us, *He is ſo aſſured he has not Palliated or Prevaricated the Doctrine of the Church of* England in his Expoſition, that he *entirely ſubmits himſelf and it to her Cenſure*; and the ſight of an *Imprimatur Carolus Alſton R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond.* prefix'd before it, is ſufficient in ſome Mens Judgments to Authorize an *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of* England; when the Approbation of ſo many Learned, Judicious and Pious Prelates of the Church of *Rome*, together with that of the whole Aſſembly of the Clergy of *France*, and of the Pope himſelf at two ſeveral times, muſt by our Author be noted as proceeding from a *Peculiar Art*, unknown to *Proteſtants*, who are accuſtomed, as he ſays, to *ſincere dealing*. But we ſhall have occaſion ſhortly to examine whether he has made uſe of that ſincerity to which he makes ſo ſtrong Pretentions.

Pref. p. 18.

Ibidem.

Pref. p. 13.

Indeed an Anſwer to his Book ſeems ſo needleſs, that I often thought it would be ſufficient to tell this Nameleſs Author, That when his *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, has receiv'd from the Church of *England* as full and as Authentick a Teſtimony of being neither *Palliated*, nor *Prevaricated* by him, as hath the *Expoſition of the Biſhop of* Meaux, from the Church Catholic; and

that

that when his Arguments appear so much as directly to confront the Bishops Exposition, it would be time enough to Publish a Justification of that Work against his Calumnies. But because this Author has declar'd (tho rashly) in the name of *Protestants*, that they look upon those *Opinions to be indefensible*, which are not maintain'd against the Assaults of every one that pleases to write against them, and that 'tis *an open, and shameful forsaking of them*, not to take care to defend every thing that is Publish'd; it may be some unwary Persons may look upon all he has said, as Gospel, unless his Discourse be unravell'd, and the mistakes he has fallen under, with the Sophistry of his Arguments be shewn.

Pref. p. 16.

But before I begin, it will be necessary to give the Reader a short Account of the Bishop of *Meaux*'s Intention in publishing this Book, and what he expected from any one who should go about to Answer it; which may serve for a true state of the Question.

And First, as for his Intention; having all along observ'd that our Doctrines were strangely Misrepresented, and that not only the private Opinions of Scholastic Authors, but even the Inventions of our Enemies, were most commonly objected to us as the Tenets of our Church, he thought it necessary *to propose her Doctrine plainly and simply, and to distinguish it aright from those Tenets which have been falsly imputed to her*, by which he hop'd many of those false Notions of her Doctrine, which divers Persons had form'd to themselves, would have been remov'd, and an Union much more easily obtain'd; For it is a certain Truth, That if the Doctrine of the *Roman Catholic* Church, when truly Represented, be Innocent and

Expos. p. 1.

Note that the Quotations out of the Exposition are from the Impression published by His Majesty's Command.

and Pure, and ſo far from deſtroying the acknowledg'd Foundations of the *Chriſtian* Faith, that it alone bears proportion and conformity to them, then all the pretended Reformations of that Doctrine are but vain and unprofitable Labours, and a Separation from that our ancient Mother-Church, upon no better Grounds, muſt be Schiſmatical; and therefore all thoſe who have broken the Unity of the Church upon ſuch a pretended Reformation, are oblig'd to return to her Boſom and Communion.

So that his Intentions were not ſo much to Argue or Diſpute upon Points of Catholic Doctrine, as to Propoſe them truly, and render them Intelligible. And therefore he pitch'd upon the Council of *Trent* as the fitteſt Compaſs by which he might ſteer his Courſe, reſolving not to deviate from its Sence, being that of the Catholic Church; but meerly to ſeparate Matters of Faith from ſuch Opinions as are *neither neceſſarily nor univerſally receiv'd.* And therefore he declar'd, Expoſ. p. 2.

Secondly, That they who would go about to Anſwer his Expoſition, ought not *to undertake to Confute the Doctrine contain'd in it, ſeeing his Deſign was only to Propoſe it without going about to Prove it*; That it would be a *quitting the Deſign of his Treatiſe to Examine the ſeveral Methods which Catholic Divines make uſe of to Eſtabliſh or Explicate the Doctrine of the Council of* Trent, *and the different Conſequences which particular Doctors have drawn from it*; That it would *avail them nothing, either to object againſt us thoſe Practiſes which they call general, or the particular Opinion of Doctors*; becauſe *it ſuffices in one word to ſay, That thoſe Practices and Opinions, be they what they will, which are not found conformable* Expoſ. p. 43. Advert. p. 20.

to

to the Intent and Decisions of the Council, are nothing to Religion, nor to the Body of the Catholic Church, nor ought by Consequence, as the pretended Reform'd do themselves avouch, to give the least pretence to Separate from us; because no one is oblig'd either to approve or follow them. Lastly, That to *urge any thing solid against his Treatise, and which may come home to the Point; it must be prov'd that the Churches Faith is not faithfully Expounded in it, and that by Acts which the same Church has oblig'd her self to receive; or else it must be shown that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the Disputes untouch'd; or in fine, it must be precisely shown in what this Doctrine subverts the Foundation of Faith.*

Daillè Apol c. 6. p. 8.

Expos. p. 43.

So that if they who Answer'd his Book brought only Arguments against the Doctrine deliver'd in it from private Authors holding particular Scholastic Opinions, and not from Authentic Acts receiv'd by the Catholic Church; or did not manifestly show the Bishop of *Condom* to have left out the chief Matters in Dispute, and touched only lesser Difficulties; or did not demonstrate how the Doctrine, as Expounded by him, subverted the remaining Maxims wherein both *Protestants* and we agree, the Bishop might justly esteem their Answers not worthy his Reflection, and that every Judicious Reader would grant his *Pieces were* (as this Author terms them, tho' in derision) *of a spirit and force sufficient to despise whatever Attempts could be made upon them* of that nature.

Pref. p. 16.

How true it is, that nothing solid of this kind was objected by the Pretended Reform'd in *France*, appears by his Advertisement. And what our Author of the *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*

England has Propos'd, is now our Province to Examine.

And first as to his Preface.

He tells us of a first Edition suppres's'd, and another with Corrections publish'd in its place, because the *Sorbon* refus'd to Approve the first. He tells us of one *Imbert* and a Pastor of *Mechlin* Condemn'd, the one by the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, and the other by the Faculty of *Lovain*, tho' they both alledg'd the Bishop of *Condom*'s Exposition for proof of their Doctrines. He tells us that Cardinal *Capisucchi* and Father *Crasset* have taught Doctrines contrary to that of the Exposition, &c. But suppose all he there says should be true, what force can his Argument bear against the Doctrine as now Explicated in the later Editions of the Exposition? what if some particular Persons have sustain'd Scholastic Opinions, which in some sence seem to thwart the Doctrine of the Exposition, as to such Scholastic Opinions; and others, like drowning Persons, have grasp'd at any thing to save themselves, whether for them or against them? It follows not that the Exposition gives us not the Doctrine of the Church. But to shew the World what has been imposed upon them on this account, by those who in their own Countries studied to maintain old Calumnies by new Inventions, I shall here insert the Copy of a Letter lately sent me by that Learned and Pious Prelate; in which they will see the true Matter of Fact as to those things alledg'd against his Exposition.

Very Reverend Father,

IT will not be difficult to anſwer your Letter of the Third Inſtant, nor to ſolve the Objections, drawn from Matters of Fact, ſent you out of *England* againſt my Expoſition of the Catholic Doctrine. The *Engliſh* Miniſter who has oppugn'd it, and whoſe Objections you have ſent me, has done nothing but gather'd together the vain Inventions which our *Huguenots* endeavor'd to publiſh here, and which are come to nothing of themſelves, without my being oblig'd to combat them.

This Author firſt tells us the *Sorbon* would not Approve to my Book. But all the World here knows I never ſo much as thought of asking it. The *Sorbon* is never us'd to Licence Books in Body: If it did, I ſhould not need its Approbation, having that of ſo many Biſhops, and being Biſhop alſo my ſelf. That Venerable Company knows better what is due to Biſhops, who are naturally, and by their Character the true Doctors of the Church, than to think they have need of the Approbation of her Doctors; when moreover moſt of thoſe

Biſhops

Biſhops who have approv'd my Book are of the Body of the *Sorbon*, and I my ſelf alſo partake of that Honor. It is a great weakneſs to require of me to produce the Approbation of *Sorbon*, when they ſee in my Book that of ſo many Learned Biſhops, that of the whole Clergy of *France* in the General Aſſembly of 1682, and that of the Pope himſelf.

You ſee by this, Sir, that it is a manifeſt Falſity to ſay, that a firſt Edition of my Book was ſuppreſs'd, becauſe the Doctors of *Sorbon* had ſomething to ſay againſt it. I never did publiſh, nor cauſe to be Printed any other Edition but that which is in the Hands of every one, to which I never added nor diminiſh'd one Syllable; and I never yet fear'd that any Catholic Doctor could find in it any thing worthy of Reprehenſion.

This to the firſt Objection of the *Engliſh* Author. As for what he adds in the Second place, That a certain *Catholic*, whoſe Name he deſigns by a Capital Letter, had written againſt me; ſuppoſe it had been true, ſo much the worſe for that ill *Catholic*. But this is as the reſt, an Invention of their own

Heads: Our *Huguenots* have in vain endeavour'd to vend ſuch falſe Wares here: no body ever yet heard of that *Catholic*; they could never name him, and all the World has ſcoffed at them for going about it.

In the Third place he tells us, That Father *Craſſet* a *Jeſuit*, has oppugned my Doctrine, in a Book Entituled, *La veritable Devotion envers la Sainte Vierge.* I have not read that Book; but neither did I ever hear it mention'd there was any thing in it contrary to mine; and that Father would be much troubled I ſhould think there was. For Cardinal *Capiſucchi*, he is ſo far from being contrary to the Doctrine I have taught, that his expreſs Approbation is to be found among thoſe which are Printed in my Edition of 1676, and it is he who, as Maſter of the Sacred Palace, Licens'd the Impreſſion of the *Italian* Verſion in the Year 1675, Printed at the Congregation *De Propagandâ Fide.* Theſe are them my Adverſaries bring againſt me.

As for that Monſieur *Imbert*, and the Paſtor of St. *Maries* at *Mechlin*, whom they pretend to have been condemn'd, tho' they alledg'd

alledg'd my Expoſition as a Warrant for their Doctrines; the Queſtion is, whether they alledg'd it right or wrong. And ſuch Matters of Fact as theſe advanc'd without Proof *, merit not any further Information.

* Or bringing the Propoſitions maintain'd by them, and Condemn'd.

But becauſe you deſire to know ſomething concerning them, I muſt tell you that this *Imbert* is a Man of no Renown, as well as of no Learning, who thought to juſtifie his Extravagances before the Archbiſhop of *Bourdeaux* his Superior, by alledging my Expoſition to this Prelate, who had Subſcribed to the Approbation in the Aſſembly of 1682. But all Mankind ſaw very well that Heaven and Earth was not more oppoſite then my Doctrine from that which this daring Perſon has preſum'd to broach. Moreover, it never enter'd into the Mind of any *Catholic*, that we ought to *adore the Croſs after the ſame manner as JESUS CHRIST in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; nor that the Croſs with JESUS CHRIST was to be ador'd as the Human Nature of our Saviour with the Divine* in the Perſon of the Son of God: And if this Man gives out he is Condemn'd for denying thoſe Errors which no body ever ſuſtain'd, he ſhews his Malice

Malice to be as great as his Ignorance.

For the Paſtor of St. *Mary* of *Mechlin*, who I am inform'd is a Perſon of Merit, I have ſeen a little Printed Treatiſe of his call'd *Motivum Juris*: where he advances this Propoſition, *That the Pope is in the Church as the Preſident in a Council, and the Major, or Bourghemaſter, as they call them in the Low-Countries, amongſt the Company of Aldermen.* A Propoſition very different from my Expoſition, where I acknowledge the Pope to be as a Head Eſtabliſh'd by God, to whom we owe Submiſſion and Obedience. If then the Faculty of *Louvain* has Cenſur'd this Book *, I am not engag'd in that Diſpute: And on the other hand, my Expoſition is ſo far from being rejected in the *Low-Countries*, that on the contrary it has been Printed at *Antwerp* in their own Language, with all the Marks of Public Authority, as well Eccleſiaſtical as Secular.

* Or any other Propoſition of that nature, which this Author, if he had been Ingenuous, ought to have mentioned.

As for thoſe Paſſages which they pretend I have Corrected in a ſecond Edition for fear of offending the *Sorbon*, it is as you ſee a chymerical Invention, and I do here once more repeat it, That I neither publiſh'd, nor conniv'd at, nor caus'd to be made any Edition

Edition of my Book, but that which is well known, in which I never alter'd any thing.

'Tis true, this little Treatiſe being at firſt given in Writing to ſome particular Perſons for their Inſtruction, many Copies of it were diſperſed, and it was Printed without my order or knowledge. No body found fault with the Doctrine contai'nd in it; and I my ſelf, without changing any thing in it of importance, and that only as to the order, and for the greater neatneſs of the Diſcourſe and Stile, caus'd it to be Printed as you now ſee. If upon that account they will have me in ſome manner to have been contrary to my ſelf, they ſhow themſelves to be too credulous.

But ſuppoſe it had been ſo, and that to free my Book from the danger of all Attempts, I had in ſome places Corrected my Expreſſions (which, God be thanked, I had no occaſion to do) the Work ought to be ſo far from being diſeſteem'd upon that account, that on the contrary it would be a Proof I had at laſt brought it to that Exactneſs, that neither the *Sorbon*, nor any other could find any thing to ſay againſt

it,

it, as in reality no *Catholic* Reprehends any thing contained in it.

The laſt Objection which this *Engliſh* Miniſter brings againſt me is, That I am fertile enough in producing new Labours, but ſteril in Anſwering what is written againſt my Works: from whence he concludes that I am conſcious they cannot be Defended. 'Tis true, I have written three little Treatiſes of Controverſie, one of which is this of the Expoſition. As the principal Objection againſt this was, That I had palliated and prevaricated the Catholic Doctrine, the beſt Anſwer I could make to it, was to relate the Approbations which were ſent me undeſignedly from all Parts of *Europe*, and that from the Pope himſelf repeated. This Anſwer will bear no Reply, and I have ſaid what was neceſſary upon that Subject in the Advertiſement prefix'd to the Edition of 1676.

If he who has ſent you the Objections of the *Engliſh* Miniſter has not ſeen this Advertiſement, I deſire you would take it up at *Cramoiſy*'s in virtue of this Order, and ſend it to him as it is Printed this Year 1686, becauſe I have there added the Approba-

probation of the *French Clergy*, and a ſecond Approbation of the Pope's very Authentic. And if he will but take the pains to joyn this Advertiſement and the Approbations to his Tranſlation of the *Expoſition*, he will render his Labour more profitable to the Public, and ſtop the Mouths of all thoſe who contradict it.

These Approbations are added in the Edition publiſh'd by his Majeſty's Command.

Concerning the two other Treatiſes which I writ upon Matters of Controverſie, one of them is upon Communion under both Species, and the other is my Conference with *M. Claude* Miniſter of *Charenton*, upon the Authority of the Church, with Reflections upon the Anſwers of that Miniſter. In theſe Treatiſes I have endeavour'd to prevent the principal Objections, and to give Anſwers to them, ſo that all Men of ſence are ſatisfi'd. After which to multiply Diſputes, and to compoſe Books after Books to embroil the Queſtion, and quit the firſt Deſign, neither do's Charity require it of me, nor do's my Employment give me leiſure.

You may ſend this Letter into *England*, that he who deſires this Information may

make uſe of what he thinks convenient; and if he think it may be beneficial, to mention he has had what concerns theſe Matters of Fact, and my Intentions from me, he may do it; and alſo aſſure them, without the leaſt apprehenſion, that there is nothing in this Letter but what is public and certain, *&c.*

From *Meaux April* the 6th 1686.

SIR,

Your very humble and affectionate Servant,

✠ J. Benigne E. de Meaux.

BEhold what the Biſhop of *Meaux* himſelf has thought good to Anſwer to a particular Account was given him by Letter touching theſe Matters of Fact. There are two things remaining in the Preface, which ſeem to require a farther Examination, becauſe they were not fully Repreſented to the Biſhop. The firſt is the Objection drawn from Cardinal *Capiſucchi*'s Book, which this Author affirms to contradict the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition. The other is the Conſequence he draws from thence, and from other pretended Actions, (to wit) That *Roman-Catholics* think it lawful *even to ſet their Hands to, and approve*

Pref. p. 13.

approve those Books, whose Principles and Doctrine they dislike.

To the First; Whereas he affirms Cardinal *Capisucchi* to have contradicted the Doctrine of the *Exposition*, we must first take notice; The Bishop of *Condom*'s intention was not to meddle with Scholastic Tenets, but purely to deliver that Doctrine of the Church which is *necessarily* and *universally* receiv'd; whereas Cardinal *Capisucchi*, being oblig'd to no such strictness, would not it may be contradict the Problematical Niceties of those Schools in which he had been Educated, so that what he said might pass without a Censure. And yet even in this, if his Sence be rightly understood, the unbiass'd Reader will plainly see that his Doctrine is the same with that of the *Exposition*.

The Bishop of *Condom* declares, from the Council of *Trent*, That we are forbidden *to believe any Divinity or Vertue in Images, for which they ought to be reverenc'd; That the Honour which is given to them ought to be referr'd to the Prototypes represented by them:* And this the Cardinal tells us in expres Terms. Oh! but he tells us of a *Divine Worship* (says this Author) *paid to the Images of the Holy Trinity, of our Blessed Saviour, and of the Holy Cross.* Whether he use that Expression or no, I know not, having not yet seen the Book; but yet this very Author tells us how the Cardinal explicates himself, That the Honour which is paid to the Images is *only upon account of the Things represented by them*, and not upon account of the Images themselves, as thinking any Divinity in them; for to do that, he confesses, would be Idolatry. And what is this, but what the Bishop of *Condom* has expres'd in other

Expos. p. 8. Sess. 24. Dec. de Invoc. &c.

Ibidem.

Terms from the Council of *Trent*, *That the Honour we render to Images has such a reference to those they represent; that by the means of those Images we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore* JESUS CHRIST. Nay more, the Cardinal tells us, *That this Honour is not to be paid to them otherwise than upon account of the Things represented by them, and as they are, in that respect, one and the same with the Thing which they represent:* And what is that, but to adore God or JESUS CHRIST *in presence of the Image*, as the Bishop of *Condom* has express'd it from the Pontifical? This St. *Thomas* explicates by a familiar Example of the Royal Robes: For, as we plainly see the Purple puts us in mind of the Prince; and so do's the Cross, of our Crucified Saviour: We pay a Sovereign Honour to the King when in His Robes, but in *Incognito* we pay not a Respect with such Formalities; 'tis not the Purple or the Robes we honour for themselves, but as making one with the King; nor is it the Cross we honour, but in respect of CHRIST: If the Honour which we shew to the Purple, or the Chair of State, may in some sence be call'd Regal or Sovereign Honour, 'tis only in respect of our King or Sovereign; and in like manner, if that Honour which is shewn to the Crucifix may in some sence be call'd Religious, or, which is more, Divine, 'tis purely in respect of JESUS CHRIST, who is both God and Man.

Sess. 25. Dec. de Inv. &c.

Ibid. Pontif. de Bened. Imag.

All the difference therefore betwixt *Cardinal Capisucchi* and the *Master of the Sacred Palace* is thus easily reconcil'd; and if there be any difference, it only consists in this, that when the Master of the Sacred Palace wrote to the Bishop of *Condom*, he approv'd his Book in which he stuck close to the necessary

neceſſary and univerſally receiv'd Doctrine of the Church, and conform'd himſelf to the Language of it, making a diſtinction betwixt the Images and things repreſented by them; whereas the Cardinal *Capiſucchi* conform'd himſelf to a Scholaſtic Stile, and ſuppos'd the Repreſentative, as Repreſentative, to be repreſentatively one and the ſame with the thing repreſented. But I needed not to have taken this pains to reconcile the Biſhop of *Meaux* with Cardinal *Capiſucchi*; ſeeing another particular Examination of the Biſhop's Book upon this Point (*Anſw. to Kapiſt Proteſting, &c. pag.* 91.) has reconcil'd the Biſhop's Doctrine with that of St. *Thomas*, that is, with Cardinal *Capiſucchi's*, tho' he erre in the right Explication of both their Doctrines.

Now Secondly, as for his Aſſertion, That we think it lawful to diſguiſe the Sentiments of our Religion; and his Confirmation of it, from the Procureur General of *Paris* his Anſwer to Father *Thomaſſin*, *That they ſuffer'd in* France *an* Italian *ſhould write according to the Principles of his Country, but for a* Frenchman *to do the ſame was another matter:* He ought to have made a diſtinction between Matters of Faith and Scholaſtic Opinions, or, to uſe other Terms, the Doctrines of a Church, and the Doctrines in a Church: Every one knows, that the Doctrines of a Church, or Matters of Faith, being Tenets neceſſarily and univerſally receiv'd, ought upon no account to be diſſembled or diſguis'd; and he can bring no one Example of that nature: But as for Scholaſtic Opinions, or the Doctrines in a Church, of which daily Diſputes are rais'd in the Schools, we ſee not only one Nation commanding one thing to be taught, and another quite the contrary; but even Pref. p. 14.

one

one Univerſity againſt another in the ſame Country, nay one College againſt another in the ſame Univerſity, without the leaſt breach of Unity, or note of *Intriguing Diſſimulation.*

Thus Father *Thomaſſin* having undertaken a Scholaſtic Diſpute of the Authority of the See Apoſtolic above that of a General Council, a Diſpute which is defended in the Schools of *Italy*, but forbid in *France*, and neither *generally* nor *neceſſarily* received by the Church, no wonder if the Procureur General of *Paris* ſhould refuſe to ſuffer it to be Printed.

Thus alſo it is the *Jeſuits* have found it convenient (upon other accounts alſo, it may be, as well as that, ſuch as is the difficulty of ſending to *Rome* for the Approbation of every Book, &c.) to take their Licences from their reſpective Provincials.

Thus much for his Preface. And as for the Collections he has given of ſome Paſſages in the Edition printed without the Biſhop of *Condom*'s conſent, we have little to ſay to them more than what the Biſhop has himſelf anſwer'd in his Letter, unleſs it be to thank this Author for being ſo ingenuous as to print them; for every unbiaſs'd Reader may there ſee, that the firſt Edition, inſtead of propoſing the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* (as this Author ſays it did) ſo *looſly and favourably, that many undeſigning Perſons of that Communion were offended at it*; did, on the contrary, (if any fault be to be found on that ſcore) propoſe the ſame Doctrine with too much ſtrictneſs. They may ſee alſo, that the *Sorbonne* was ſo far from *marking out* (as he ſays) *ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable Parts of it, wherein the Expoſition, by too much deſire of palliating, had abſolutely perverted the Doctrine of their Church*, that this very Author,

Pref. p. 2.

Ibid. p. 3.

Ibid.

thor, in his Collections, could not propoſe one Doctrine ſo perverted, without a forced Interpretation of his own; nay, on the contrary, he is ſenſible, that in ſome places the Biſhop had rather ſpoken with too much ſtrictneſs; and therefore, after his wonted way of turning all things to a wrong intention, he tells his Reader, That th' other was really the true Sence of the Church, but it was *thought too ingenuous*; and *'tis not fit Proteſtants ſhould know it*: And in another place, That *the firſt Expoſition ran much higher than it ſeems the Spirit of the* Gallicane *Church could bear. But it may be what was ſtruck out of the Expoſition to pleaſe the Correctors*, M. de Meaux *recompenſed in his Letter to ſatisfie his Holineſs.* Collect. p. 23. Ibid. p. 32.

But if in ſome other Places he has either retrench'd or alter'd his Expreſſion, any one, who is not willing to take every thing by a wrong Handle, may eaſily ſee it was not out of ſuch ill Deſigns as this Author endeavours to perſuade us; but purely to retrench what was not conformable to his Deſign of a bare Expoſition, or what had been ſufficiently expreſs'd before; to keep himſelf more preciſely to the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; or to obviate any malicious Interpretations, which Perſons, diſpoſed to take all things in a wrong ſence, might force upon his Expreſſions, if he worded them not more cautiouſly.

But, above all, it ſeems to me moſt ſtrange that any, eſpecially one who dares publiſh to the World the Doctrine of a Church, ſhould make the alteration or retrenchment of ſome manner of Expreſſions in a Book writ, as he owns, four Years before, ſo hainous a Crime, that the Author muſt needs paſs for

for one that either did not understand his own Doctrine, or at least had not the Sincerity to Expound it right. He may wish, it may be, he had been as cautious in his own Book, as the Bishop was in his.

Pref. p. 4.

However, we have nothing to do with the first Impression. 'Tis this other, put out by the Bishop of *Meaux* himself, which has been presented to you, and to which so many Authentic Approbations and Testimonies have been given: And I affirm he must be strangely deceiv'd, or wilfully blind, who will not grant it to contain the true Doctrine of the Church, according to the Sence of the Council of *Trent*. But now to the Book it self.

PART II.

ART. I.

INTRODUCTION.

SHould I undertake to examine all the Calumnies, Misrepresentation, unsincere Dealings, and Falsifications of this Author, in almost every Article, I should swell this Answer beyond the Bounds I have prescrib'd to my self, and make it tedious to the Reader; yet some however I shall take notice of as they fall in my way; from whence I hope we shall find this advantage, that all those Books to which an *Imprimatur*, *Carolus Alston*, *&c.* is prefixed, will not hereafter be concluded free from Errours; nor will every nameless Author, who professes to be sincere, pass hereafter for an Oracle. His

His Introduction is Calumny in a high Degree, and the State of his Queſtion drawn from thence as unſincere.

He tells us of *adoring Men and Women, Croſſes, Images, and Relics; of ſetting up our own Merits, and making other Propitiatory Sacrifices for Sin, diſtinct from that of the Croſs*, which, he ſays, are contrary to our pretended Principles, (to wit) *That Religious Worſhip is due to God alone; That we are to be ſav'd only by Chriſt's Merits*; and, *That the Death of CHRIST was a perfect Sacrifice:* but yet are not, as he tells us, *obſcure Conſequences drawn from our Doctrines*, but the *plain and confeſſed Opinions of the Church of* Rome, *the Practice and Preſcription of the Chiefeſt Authority in it*: and therefore for us *to refuſe their Charge, is to proteſt againſt a matter of Fact; a Plea which even Juſtice it ſelf has told us may without Calumny, be rejected as invalid.* Introd. p. 3, 4, 5. p. 5.

Were theſe Doctrines and Practices, which he alledges, the plain and confeſſed Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, he would, 'tis true, have reaſon to ſay they contradict our Principles: But ſeeing they are all ſo ſolemnly renounced by us, that we deteſt the very thoughts of them, and cannot hear theſe repeated Accuſations without nauſeating them; and ſeeing he has been ſo often told, that theſe Conſequences are not only far-fetch'd, obſcure, and diſavowed; but Conſequences which are ſo falſe, that no Connection can be found betwixt them and our Doctrines and Practices when truly repreſented; we have juſt reaſon to refuſe the Charge, and tell him, they have no more Juſtice to accuſe us of them, than Diſſenters from the Church of *England* have to accuſe her of Idolatry and Superſtition, for

Bowing to the Altar, and at the Name of JESUS, or for uſing the Croſs in Baptiſm; or then the Quakers have for accuſing them and us of breach of the Firſt Commandment, becauſe we uſe the Civility of Hat and Knee to them who are but meer Creatures as we our ſelves.

But however, theſe things muſt be charged upon us as an Introduction; and then the Queſtion muſt be ſtated after a new mode, and we repreſented as conſenting to it.

Pag. 5. He tells us therefore, That they have got thus much at leaſt by that Reflection; that it ſhews them how *they, who have been ſo often charged by the Church of* Rome *as* INNOVATORS IN RELIGION, *are at laſt, by our own Confeſſion, allowed to hold the Ancient and Undoubted Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith*; and from this pretended Conceſſion he draws up the State of the Controverſie, you may be certain, favourably to himſelf. But who is it (I pray) that allows him this Propoſition, That the New Reformers hold the *Ancient and Undoubted Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith*? and where do's he allow it?

Sect. 2. p. 2. The Expoſition has, 'tis true, a Section to ſhew, how *thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion acknowledge the Catholic Church to embrace all the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion*: But how do's he from thence ſhew that Catholics reciprocally grant them to hold all thoſe Fundamental Articles? I ſay, *all*; for no body ever deny'd they held ſome of them.

This Author knows very well, we are ſo far from granting this to them, that, on the contrary, we always accuſe them of *Innovations*, and denying thoſe Articles which are Fundamental, and

as

as neceſſary and as plainly revealed, as many of thoſe others which they admit.

We always affirm, We are in poſſeſſion of our Doctrines and our Practices, that theſe have been delivered down to us by our Predeceſſors, as Truths revealed to the Prophets and Apoſtles; we always tell them, We have the Deciſions of a Church in our behalf; a Church, I ſay, which is *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*; a Church againſt which *the Gates of Hell*, by the expreſs Promiſe of JESUS CHRIST, *was never to prevail*; and in which *Paſtors and Teachers were to remain for ever, leſt we ſhould be led away with every wind of Doctrine*: We tell them, He who denies one Article revealed by God, and propoſed by his Church as ſo revealed, is as guilty of the Breach of Faith, as he who denies them all; becauſe he rejects God's Veracity, upon which that Faith is grounded: And by conſequence, we cannot but tell them, That whilſt they renounce thoſe Articles, which we believe are revealed Truths, they are guilty of Fundamental Errors, and hold not the *Ancient and Undoubted Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith.*

1 Tim. 3. 15.

Matth. 16. 18.

Eph. 4. 11, 12, &c.

So that the true State of the Controverſie in general betwixt Catholics and Proteſtants is, whether they or we do Innovate; they, in refuſing to believe thoſe Doctrines we profeſs to have receiv'd with the Grounds of Chriſtianity; or we, in maintaining our Poſſeſſion. And the Diſpute is, Whether *Roman* Catholics ought to maintain their Poſſeſſion, for which many Proteſtants themſelves grant they have a Preſcription of above 1000 Years? or whether the Authorities, brought by Proteſtants againſt the *Roman* Catholic Doctrine, be ſo weighty, that every *Roman* Catholic is oblig'd to renounce the Commu-

nion of that Church in which he was bred up, and quit his Preſcription and Poſſeſſion? Which certainly they are not obliged to do, unleſs it can be plainly prov'd they have innovated, or taught ſuch Doctrines as *overthrow thoſe Truths which are on both Sides allow'd to be Divine.*

This the Biſhop of *Condom* knew they could never do, and that our Doctrines, when truly repreſented, were ſo far from contradicting thoſe mutually-received Articles of our Faith, that, on the contrary, they confirm'd our Belief of them: And therefore he undertook to ſeparate the Articles of our Faith, from what was falſly imputed to us, and reſolved to propoſe them according to the received Sence of the Church declared in the Council of *Trent.* And whether he has faithfully perform'd this Undertaking, or no, is our preſent Queſtion, which we are to examine in theſe following Articles.

What do's it therefore avail this Author to tell us, he will, in the following Articles, endeavour to

Pag. 6. *give a clear and free Account of what they can approve, and what they diſlike in the Doctrines of the Catholic Church*; unleſs he firſt ſhew us, and that by ſome Authentic Acts of the Church, that thoſe are her Doctrines; and ſecondly, give us ſome aſſurance, of greater Authority then the Preſcription of the *Roman* Catholic Church, that they are Novelties or Erroneous.

ART.

ART. II.

Religious Worſhip is terminated only in God.

THat *all Religious Worſhip is terminated in God alone*, is the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Aſſertion, and the Churches Doctrine; to which both this, and another later Author agree; but both of them will have the Invocation of Saints, and the Honour which we pay to Images and Relics, to be inconſiſtent with that Maxim. Art. 2. Anſwer to a Diſcourſe entituled *Papiſts Proteſting, &c.*

What the Biſhop has ſaid is enough to ſatisfie any one, who is not obſtinate; his Words are theſe: *The ſame Church teaches us, That all Religious Worſhip ought to terminate in God, as its neceſſary End; and that if the Honour which ſhe renders to the Bleſſed Virgin, and to the Saints, may in ſome ſence be call'd Religious, it is for its neceſſary relation to God.* Expoſ. p. 4. From which Words it is plain, the Biſhop thought Religious Honour or Worſhip might be taken in a double ſence; the firſt ſtrict, and that he acknowledges is only due to God; the other in a larger ſence, which may be paid to Creatures. But how this other may be called Religious Honour, he tells us is, becauſe of the reference which it has to God. Thus that Civil Honour or Obedience which we pay to Magiſtrates, if we do it for Conſcience ſake, that is, purely to obey the Ordinance of God, may be not improperly call'd a Religious Honour or Obedience, becauſe by Honouring or Obeying them, for God's ſake, we Honour and Obey God: Thus *to viſit the orphan and the widow in their tribulations* is called by St. *James a clean and unſpotted Religion.* James 1. 27.

But

But if we take Religion in a ſtricter ſence, for a Supreme and Sovereign Honour, or an *adheſion to an Independent Being with all the Powers of our Soul, &c.* it is only proper to God, and cannot be paid to Creatures: and in that ſence the Honour which we pay to our Bleſſed Lady, and other Saints, is far from being a Religious Honour. *Let* Mary *be Honoured, but let God be Adored,* was the Saying of an ancient Father; not with Divine Honour, for that is due to God alone, *Soli Deo honor & gloria*; but with an Inferiour Honour, which if our Authors will not have us call Religious, we will not diſpute about the Name. We ought not to deprive God of any thing that is due to him alone, that we may give it to his Creatures; neither Honour, nor Worſhip, nor Prayer, nor Thankſgiving, nor Sacrifice: But yet we may honour thoſe whom God has honoured; we may give an inferiour Degree of Worſhip to thoſe who are in ſome Degree of Honour above us in this World, and why not to the Inviſible Inhabitants of the other, ſo it elevate them not above the State of Creatures? We may pray to our Friends and Parents here on Earth, to pray for us, without derogating from our Duty to God; and why the ſame may not be addreſſed to Saints and Angels, who are no leſs our Friends, without robbing God of what is his due, is, I muſt confeſs, to me unintelligible. If you tell me the firſt is only Civil; or if it may be called a *Religious Love or Honour*, when it is done *for God's ſake*; yet it is *but an extrinſecal Denomination from the Cauſe and Motive, not from the Nature of the Act*, and therefore cannot make Gods of them; we affirm the ſame of the ſecond, and renounce any other ſort of Religious Worſhip, which

Epiph. Hær. 79.

Anſw. to *Papiſt Proteſt.* p. 38.

which is ſo from the nature of the Act, and by conſequence only due to God. This Diſtinction reflected on will be ſufficient to anſwer all the Objections brought againſt our Doctrine by both thoſe Authors: And we cannot but wonder, that Perſons ſhould uſe ſo many endeavours not to underſtand us; and beExpoſ. p. 10. cauſe, as the Biſhop of *Condom* has obſerv'd, in *one ſence Adoration, Invocation, and the name of Mediator are only proper to God and* JESUS CHRIST, we are aſtoniſh'd why they will ſtill miſapply thoſe terms to render our Doctrine odious; whereas if they would but ſtrictly keep to the ſence, in which we uſe them, all their Objections and Accuſations would looſe their force, and we might have ſome hopes of a more Chriſtian Unity.

ART. III.

Invocation of Saints.

AS for the Invocation of Saints, he grants with Art. 3. p. 9. Monſieur *Daillè*, that ſeveral of the Primitive Fathers, in the Fourth Age of the Church, made pag. 7. Addreſſes to them; but will have them to be only *Innocent Wiſhes*, and *Rhetorical Flights*; What Authority do's he bring for this Aſſertion, and his farther accuſation of theſe *Fathers of the Fourth Century*, that they *did certainly begin to depart from the* pag. 8. *Practice and Tradition of thoſe before them*? Did any in that or the following Ages accuſe or cenſure them? If not, by what Authority do's he condemn thoſe Prayers, thoſe *Innocent Wiſhes*, and Holy *Raptures* (as he calls them, becauſe he will not have them to be *Prayers*) as *fond things vainly invented*, &c.

We

We only tell you it is lawful to Pray to them, and condemn ſuch as cenſure all thoſe Antient and Orthodox Fathers. What Authority have you to oppoſe us? You ſay it is *repugnant to Gods Word*; ſhew that Word? If you cannot, we are in Poſſeſſion, and the Antiquity and Uninteruptedneſs of our Doctrine, beſides the Reaſonableneſs and Innocence of it, confirms us in our belief, and ought to be more prevalent with us, than all the Sophiſtical Arguments brought againſt us.

We name them in our Sacrifices, and give God thanks for the Victories they have obtain'd through his Grace, and humbly beſeech him to vouchſafe to favour us by their Interceſſion; if we mention their *Merits*, 'tis only thoſe Victories they had obtain'd by his Favours, which we beſeech him to look upon and not to regard our unworthineſs; even as we beg of him to hear their Prayers, which are more prevalent then our own, becauſe more pure. But this is far from ſuch an idle fancy, as *if Chriſt, who is our Sacrifice, needed*, as he ſays *the Aſſiſtance of St.* Bathildis *or* Potentiana *to recommend him to his Father, or the deſerts of a St.* Martin *to obtain our forgiveneſs.* We deteſt ſuch thoughts; and abominate ſuch Doctrines. The Biſhop of *Condom* has fully explicated our Tenets, what this Author or others impoſe upon us, we are not to anſwer for, nor are we concerned to maintain the ill conſequences which follow from ſuch Impoſitions.

pag. 12.

ART.

ART. IV.

Images and Relics.

HIs next Article of Images and Relics complains how the approved Doctrine of our most reputed Writers contradicts what *M. de Meaux* would have us to think is their only design in that Service. Let us examine this a little? Art. 4. Pag. 13.

The Bishop of *Condom*'s business is to explicate the universally approv'd Doctrine of the Church, according to the Sentiments of the Council of *Trent*, and not to meddle with Scholastic Opinions, or those Practices which are neither necessary, nor generally received. He tells us therefore, "That all the Ho- Expos. Sect. 5. "nour that is given them, ought to be referred to the pag. 8. "Prototypes represented by them; and that we do "not attribute to them any other Vertue but that of "exciting in us the Remembrance of those they re- "present; That the Honour we render them is "grounded upon this, that the very seeing of the "Image of JESUS CHRIST Crucified cannot but ex- "cite in us a more lively Remembrance of him who "died upon the Cross for our Redemption; That "whilst this Image before our Eyes causes this pre- "cious Remembrance in our Souls, we are natural- "ly moved to testifie, by some exteriour Signs, "how far our Gratitude bears us; which exteriour "Signs are not paid to the Image, but to JESUS "CHRIST represented by that Image. So that, properly speaking, according to the Bishop of *Meaux*'s sence, and that of the Council, the Image of the Cross is to be only look'd upon as a Representative

or Memorative Sign, which is therefore apt to put us in mind of JESUS CHRIST, who ſuffered upon the Croſs for us: and the Honour which we there ſhew, preciſely ſpeaking, and according to the Eccleſiaſtic Style, is not properly to the Croſs, but to JESUS CHRIST, repreſented by that Croſs. Not to JESUS CHRIST as preſent in, or with, or to that Croſs, as if the Croſs it ſelf were the Object of our Worſhip (as another Anſwerer repreſents our Doctrine); but to him in Heaven, whoſe becoming Man, and dying for us, we remember by looking upon the Croſs. So that JESUS CHRIST is the ſole Object of our Adoration, and not the Croſs.

Anſwer to *Papiſt Proteſting*, Sect. 5. paſſim.

The Croſs therefore, whether taken as Wood or Stone, or moreover as the Image of JESUS CHRIST Crucified, is not properly the Object of our Worſhip; but is a Help to recall our wandring Thoughts back to a Conſideration of the Benefits we have received by his dying for us: and whilſt we have theſe good thoughts in our Minds, our Affections are inflamed, and we, in preſence of that Image, which occaſioned thoſe pious Affections, ſhew, by ſome exteriour Act, what are our inward Sentiments, and pay our Adorations to our Redeemer, but not to the Image that repreſents him.

This is the Pure and Innocent Doctrine of the Church, without mixture of Scholaſtic Subtilities: and this the above-named Author acknowledges *to be very innocent*. "It is (ſays he) a very innocent "thing to worſhip GOD or CHRIST, when any Na- "tural or Inſtituted Sign brings them to our minds, "even in the preſence of ſuch a Sign: as if a Man, "upon viewing the Heavens and the Earth, and the "Creatures that are in it, ſhould raiſe his Soul to "God,

Ibid. p. 84.

"God, and adore the Great Creator of the World; "or upon the accidental ſight of a Natural Croſs "(*and why not upon the deſigned ſight of an Artificial one?*) ſhould call to mind the Love of his Lord "who died for him, and bow his Soul to him in "the moſt ſubmiſſive Adorations. But becauſe he could not deny this to be Innocent, therefore he will not have it to be the Doctrine of our Church; but will have the Uſe of Images in our Church to be *not primarily for Remembrance, but for Worſhip*: and this, he tells us, the *Council of Trent expreſly teaches*, but is far from proving it. The Council indeed tells us (as he cites) That *the Images of JESUS CHRIST, &c. are to be had and retained eſpecially in Churches* (not as he renders it, *eſpecially to be had and kept in Churches*) *and that due Honour and Veneration is to be given them —— becauſe the Honour given them is referred to the Prototypes.* But it never tells us the Primary Uſe of Images is for Worſhip. Nay, on the contrary, this Council, preſently after, commanding Biſhops to teach diligently the ſeveral Benefits that occur by the Repreſentations of the Myſteries of our Redemption, makes not the leaſt mention of that of Worſhip, but only that they are to Teach, to Inſtruct, to Recal to our remembrance, to excite our Imitation, and the like. But he tells us, that a *meer Sign*, which only calls CHRIST to our Mind, can deſerve no Honour or Worſhip: and therefore ſeems to conclude, That ſince the Council of *Trent* allows of a due Honour to Images, ſhe muſt allow it to them as *Signs repreſenting the Perſon of CHRIST as if he were preſent; which whether they raiſe our Hearts to him in Heaven or no, yet, according to the Council of* Trent, (ſays he) *muſt di-*

Ibid. Pag. 85.

Seſſ. 25 Dec. de Invoc. &c.

In Templis præſertim habendas & retinendas.

Ibid.

Ibid. pag. 85.

rect our Worſhip to him as repreſented in his Image. That a meer Sign deſerves no Honour, as ſuch, we deny; but that this Honour which it deſerves muſt be the ſame with that which is due to the thing ſignified, neither do's the Council of *Trent*, nor the Church determine: The Council tells us only, That *due Honour and Veneration* is to be paid them upon account of their Prototypes; but never tells us of what nature this Honour is. What are the Scholaſtic Opinions concerning this, is not to our preſent purpoſe; ſeeing we ſpeak here only of univerſally received Tenets. And what he would perſuade the World to be our Doctrines, as, That we do *direct our Worſhip to JESUS CHRIST as repreſented in his Image*; *That we worſhip him before the Image, in that Worſhip which we give to the Image*; and that we look upon Images as *Legal Proxies or Repreſentatives* of JESUS CHRIST and his Saints, and therefore pay the ſame Worſhip to them as to the Prototypes; are neither the Doctrines of the Church, nor of the Schools, who neither of them look upon Images as Proxies, to which the ſame Debt is due as that which ought to be paid to the Perſon in whoſe Place it is; but only as Signs or Repreſentatives, before which we may adore that Divine Object which thoſe Signs bring to our remembrance, and which we may make uſe of as a more effectual Means to put us in mind of that Object. Some Honour, notwithſtanding, is due to this Image thus repreſenting JESUS CHRIST, (for example) as there is ſome Honour due to the Image of our Sovereign; but of what nature this Honour is, is not defin'd by the Council.

Pag. 85.
Pag. 91.

There

There is a vaſt difference then betwixt a Legal Proxy or Delegate, and an Image or Repreſentative. The Picture of my Father is his Image or Repreſentative, but cannot be called his Proxy or his Delegate. Pictures or Images are only made uſe of to call thoſe Perſons, whoſe Pictures they are, to our remembrance, either by repreſenting their Features (if we had formerly known the Perſons) or ſome additional Marks, expreſſing ſome Actions of their Lives by which they are known: but they were never uſed by Chriſtians as the Proxies or Delegates of thoſe Perſons they repreſented to our Minds. Whether the Heathens uſed the Images of their Gods as their Proxies or Delegates, is not my preſent purpoſe to diſcuſs; but this is certain, they thought a Divinity was annexed to thoſe Images, and ſome of them eſteemed them Gods, and others thought them the Repreſentatives of their Gods, who were not Gods, but rather Devils; and therefore when they offered Incence to them, and adored them, they were properly Idolaters. Juſt Diſcharge, Part 3.

The uſe we make of Pictures or Images is purely as Repreſentatives, or (that we may uſe his Term) *Memorative Signs*, which call the Originals to our remembrance; and the Honour which we pay to them is of the ſame nature with that which we pay to the Name of *JESUS*. When we either hear that Sound, or ſee thoſe Characters, they bring the Author of our Redemption to our remembrance, and we bow the Knee and adore him. 'Tis not the Syllables nor the Characters that we adore, tho' we have a reſpect for them, and would not uſe any Indignity towards them, becauſe they are Repreſentative Signs; but it is *JESUS CHRIST*, repreſented by

by them, whom we adore. Thus after the ſame manner, when we ſee or read any other thing which brings his Life, his Death, his Sufferings to our Minds, we adore him in preſence of that which calls thoſe Pious Objects to our remembrance: neither are we therefore ſaid to adore thoſe Letters, that Book, or thoſe Reſemblances which cauſe ſuch Thoughts, tho' we kneel, or bow, or proſtrate our ſelves before them.

Neither is it more culpable to make uſe of thoſe Pictures, than of Books: For if we would meditate upon the Paſſion of our Bleſſed Saviour, we endeavour to form in our Minds a Repreſentation of his Sufferings; 'tis not that Idea or Repreſentation which we compaſſionate and adore, but Him who truly ſuffer'd for us: But our Minds being accuſtomed to wander, and thoſe Ideas which keep our Thoughts fixed upon him being apt to paſs away; therefore we either take a Book, or Crucifix, or other Repreſentation of his Paſſion; which whilſt we look upon, thoſe Ideas return to our Imagination, and we being piouſly affected, renew our Compaſſion or our Adorations, not to the Bible or the Crucifix, but to the Author of our Redemption.

In like manner, in our Public Service, we deſire to offer Incence to him who died upon the Croſs for our Redemption; we fix our Eyes upon, and burn Incence before the Crucifix which repreſents him; not as if the Crucifix were his Delegate or Proxy, placed there on purpoſe to receive our Homage due to Him: but becauſe by viewing That our Thoughts are fixed upon the Original who is repreſented by it to our Minds, and to whom we offer Incence.

If this Homage, which we pay in preſence of the Image, be termed by ſome a Homage paid to the Image, (which is an improper Speech) they explicate themſelves, and tell us, That it is purely to it as to a Repreſentative, and upon account of that Repreſentation; not as to a Proxy or a Delegate, placed to receive that Homage, and to which upon that account it is due, as when we pay a Homage to a Vice-Roy upon account of the King in whoſe ſtead he is: for there the Vice-Roy is the immediate Object of our Honour, tho' only mediately of that Sovereign Honour which is due to the King whom he repreſents; but only as to an inanimate Being, to which nothing is due of it ſelf, but purely upon account of that Animate Being which it calls to our remembrance, and as it calls it to our remembrance. Thus is there no Honour due to the Statue or Reſemblance of a King, as it is a Statue; but only as it is his Reſemblance: neither is that Statue his Delegate, but a memorative Sign of him, and which we honour as ſuch: and thus as the Indignities offered to that Statue are interpretatively offered to the King; ſo is the Honour which is ſhewn it, as repreſenting him, interpretatively offered to the King whom it repreſents. In like manner that Homage which we pay to *JESUS CHRIST*, repreſented by the Croſs, is, properly ſpeaking, Adoration: But nothing at all is due to the Croſs for it ſelf; for that is an inanimate Being, capable of no Honour; but that Adoration is due to him who being an animate Nature, is called to our Minds by that Reſemblance.

The want of taking this our Doctrine in a right ſence, has been the occaſion of that Author's prolix Diſcourſe of about Twenty three Leaves; in which he

he has not at all combated our Doctrine, but only ſome Scholaſtic Opinions, and that with ſo few Additions of any new Difficulties, that all he has ſaid has been formerly refuted in the *Juſt Diſcharge to Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Unjuſt Charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of Rome*, to which I will refer the Reader, and return to my other Antagoniſt, and ſee what he brings againſt this our Doctrine.

Expoſ. of the Doct. of the Ch. of *Engl.* p. 14.

Firſt, he tells us, That St. *Thomas* and his Followers were never Cenſured for maintaining, in plain terms, That *the Image of the Croſs ought to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip as that Saviour who ſuffered on it.* In anſwer to this, I need only tell him, We are not here to maintain every Opinion held by the Schools, nor is it neceſſary the Church ſhould Cenſure them, unleſs they formally contradict her Doctrine, which St. *Thomas* is far from being guilty of: But, if he had been ſincere, he ought to have taken notice of the Reaſon brought by St. *Thomas* and his Followers, which ſhews, That it is purely upon account of *JESUS CHRIST* repreſented, that is, brought to our remembrance by it, and not upon any account of the Croſs it ſelf. Which Reaſon, if rightly underſtood, ſpeaks no more than this, That whilſt I ſee the Figure of our Bleſſed Saviour Crucified, I, by bowing in preſence of that Crucifix, adore him in Heaven; and if I bow, or kneel, or proſtrate my ſelf before that Crucifix, that Bowing, Kneeling, or Proſtration may be termed Adoration; becauſe it tends to *JESUS CHRIST*, the true Object of our Adoration, who is repreſented to my Mind by that Crucifix. It is therefore an Adoration of *JESUS CHRIST* repreſented by the Crucifix, but not an Adoration of the Crucifix it ſelf: For this Holy

Doctor

Doctor declares, That no Reverence is due to any thing for it ſelf, but to a Rational Nature; but that an Irrational Creature may be honoured with reſpect to a Rational Nature which it repreſents; which Honour do's not terminate in the Irrational Creature, but in the Rational Nature: upon which account he maintains, That that Honour is the ſame with that which is paid to that Rational Nature. 3. Qu. 25. Art. 3. in Corpore.

The Pontifical alſo (ſays he) admits the ſame. In the ſame ſence, I grant, but not in that which he would willingly make us believe it do's. He tells us indeed, That in the Prayers for Bleſſing the Image of the Croſs, he who performs that Ceremony, amongſt other Prayers, begs of God, *That as many as bow down before it, may find Health both of their Souls and Bodies by it:* Which he will have to be irreconcilable with the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Doctrine, and that of the Council of *Trent*, which forbids us to believe any Divinity or Vertue tied to Images, for which they ought to be adored, *&c.* But if he had dealt ingenuouſly, he would not have ſuppreſſed the Reaſon of that Bowing mentioned by the Pontifical, which would have eaſily reconciled the whole. The Words are theſe: *Ut orantes inclinanteſque ſe* propter Deum *ante iſtam Crucem inveniant corporis & animæ ſanitatem.* But he thought it better to leave out the words *propter Deum, for the ſake of God:* And this is his uſual way of citing Authors. All the reſt of his Expreſſions drawn from the Pontifical are of the ſame nature, either lame, or patch'd up from ſeveral Places; and therefore if they make any thing againſt us, are not worthy our regarding.

See alſo the ſame quoted, and falſly rendred in *Engliſh* by the Anſwerer to the *Papiſt Proteſting*. pag. 76.

But he has another Argument, and that from an Authentic Act of the Church her ſelf in her *Good-Friday* Solemnity; in which *the whole Church addreſſes her ſelf* (ſays he) *to the Croſs in theſe very dangerous words: Behold the Wood of the Croſs! come let us adore it:* And he tells us, *the whole ſolemnity of that days Service plainly ſhews we do adore it in the utmoſt propriety of the Phraſe:* But here he has been alſo ſo unfortunate, as not to give us all the Words of the Church, and to add another which is not there, to make it ſpeak his Sence. The Words ſung by the Church in that Service are theſe, *Ecce Lignum Crucis, in quo pependit Salus Mundi: venite Adoremus: Behold the Wood of the Croſs, on which the Saviour of the World did hang: come let us Adore.* He ſaw well enough theſe words taken altogether, would be a clear Explication of our Doctrine, and ſhew it was not the Croſs we adored, but the Saviour of the World who hung upon it; and therefore he concealed theſe laſt Words, and added the word *it*, and ſo gives us this mutilated Sentence, *Behold the Wood of the Croſs! come let us Adore IT* inſtead of the other.

But do's not the Church in her Hymns of the Paſſion and Invention, pray to the Croſs in expreſs terms? In this, indeed, he ſeems to have ſome ſhew of reaſon; but how often has he been told, theſe are Poetical Expreſſions, and that the word Croſs, by a Figure ſufficiently known to Poets, ſignifies JESUS CHRIST Crucified, to whom we pray in thoſe Hymns.

Now as the Honour which we pay to Images is referr'd to thoſe, who are repreſented by them; ſo likewiſe, is that Honour and Veneration which we pay to the

the Sacred Relics of thoſe Saints, who were Victims to God, entirely referr'd to them whoſe remains they are.

He tells us, *If that be the ſtate of the Queſtion*, which the Biſhop of *Condom* has propos'd, *they confeſs that the Explication of it has taken away a great part of the difficulty, and that if this be all* M. de Meaux *deſires of them, they are ready to profeſs their Opinion, that they judge it to be neither offenſive to God, nor fit to be ſcrupled by Man.* But leaſt we ſhould be thus agreed, the Biſhop muſt not be allow'd to have explicated our Tenets right; and therefore, either ſome practices, or abuſes, (which might have paſt amongſt thoſe which he ſays we complain of) muſt be brought againſt him; or elſe the Council of *Trent* muſt be again Corrupted by him in order to it. He tells us, he can allow of Honouring them, but that the Council of *Trent* ſays, *We are to Worſhip them, and that by ſo doing, we ſhall obtain many Benefits and Graces of God. That theſe Sacred Monuments are not unprofitably revered, but are TO BE SOUGHT UNTO for the obtaining their help and aſſiſtance; to cure the Sick, to give Eyes to the Blind, Feet to the Lame, and even Life to the Dead*: Any one, to hear theſe words quoted, as from the Council of *Trent*, would really think we pray'd and ſought unto thoſe Relics, that we might obtain *ſight for the Blind, &c.* whereas the words of the Council expreſs no ſuch thing; which, to the end you may not think I Cavil, I will here give you as they lye. *Sanctorum quoque martyrum, & aliorum cum Chriſto viventium ſancta corpora, quæ viva membra fuerunt Chriſti, & templum Spiritus ſancti, ab ipſo ad æternam vitam ſuſcitanda & glorifi-* pag. 17.

canda à fidelibus veneranda esse, per quæ multa bèneficia à Deo hominibus præstantur: ita ut affirmantes Sanctorum Reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandæ causâ Sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, omnino damnandos esse, prout jam pridem eos damnavit, & nunc etiam damnat Ecclesia. "The Holy Catholic "Church teaches also, that the Holy Bodies of "Saints and Martyrs living with *Christ*, which "were the living Members of Christ, and the Tem- "ples of the Holy Ghost, and are one Day to be "raised again to Eternal Life, and glorified by him, "are to be *Venerated* by the Faithful, by which Bo- "dies many benefits have been granted by God to "Men: So that they who affirm, that no *Veneration* or *Honour* is due to the Relics of Saints, or "that those Relics, and other Sacred Monuments, "are unprofitably honoured by the Faithful; or that "they do in vain frequent the Memories of the "Saints, to the end they may obtain their aid (*the "aid of the Saints eorum*) are wholly to be condem- "ned, as the Church do's now, and has also formerly "condemned them.

Sess. 25. dic. de Invoc. &c.

Hieronymus advers. Vigilantium.

Conc. Nic. 2. Can. 7.

You see there is not one word here of *Worshipping* them, unless we take *Veneration* for it, which in some sence may pass, but not in this; neither is there one word of *seeking to these Sacred Monuments to obtain their help and assistance; to cure the Sick*, &c. These are wholly his own inventions put upon us for the words of the Council, he might very well say these were *fond things vainly invented*, &c. we require them not from him. All we desire is what he professes they are ready to perform: *We will*, (says he)

he) *Honour the Relics of the Saints as the Primitive Church did: We will reſpect the Images of our Saviour and the Bleſſed Virgin; and as ſome of us now bow towards the Altar, and all of us are enjoyned to do ſo at the Name of the Lord* JESUS; *ſo will we not fail to teſtifie all due Reſpect to his Repreſentation.* Pag. 18. We will not quarrel with him about the manner how we ought to call that Reſpect and Honour; and if any of ours ſay, that Honour and Reſpect being only due upon account of the Things they repreſent, and no ways upon their own, ought therefore to have the ſame Denomination with that which is due to the Original, I hope ſuch an Explication, being no ways injurious to the Originals, deſerves not ſo ſevere a Cenſure as ſome of them are pleaſed to give it; neither ought the Church, which is not concerned with thoſe Opinions which are purely Scholaſtic, to ſuffer for what is probably diſputed of in the Schools. Thoſe who would ſee more of this Point, may be pleas'd to read the *Juſt Diſcharge to Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Unjuſt Charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of Rome*, and *Veron's Rule of Faith*, upon this Head: and they who have not thoſe Books, may be pleas'd to reflect ſeriouſly upon the foregoing Paſſages, and this following tranſcribed out of the Council of *Trent*.

Imagines porro Chriſti, Deiparæ Virginis, & aliorum Sanctorum, in templis præſertim habendas & retinendas, eiſque debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam; non quod credatur ineſſe aliqua in iis divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam ſint colendæ, vel quod ab eis ſit aliquid petendum: vel quod fiducia in imaginibus ſit figenda; veluti olim fiebat à Gentibus, quæ Pſal. 134. *in idolis ſpem ſuam collocabant; ſed quoniam honos,*

qui

qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ repræsentant: ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, & coram quibus caput aperimus & procumbimus, Christum adoremus & Sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt, veneremur; id quod Conciliorum, præsertim vero secundæ Nicænæ Synodi decretis contra imaginum oppugnatores est sancitum.

Conc. Nic. 2. Actio. 3, 4, & 6.

Illud vero diligenter doceant Episcopi, per historias mysteriorum nostræ redemptionis, picturis vel aliis similitudinibus expressas, erudiri & confirmari populum in articulis fidei commemorandis, & assidue recolendis: tum vero ex omnibus sacris imaginibus magnum fructum percipi; non solum quia admonetur populus beneficiorum & munerum quæ à Christo sibi collata sunt: sed etiam quia Dei per Sanctos miracula & salutaria exempla oculis Fidelium subjiciuntur: ut pro iis Deo gratias agant, ad Sanctorumque imitationem vitam moresque suos componant: excitenturque ad adorandum, ac diligendum Deum, & ad pietatem colendam. Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit, aut senserit, anathema sit. In has autem sanctas & salutares observationes si qui abusus irrepserint, eos prorsus aboleri sancta Synodus vehementer cupit; ita ut nullæ falsi dogmatis imagines & rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem præbentes, statuantur. Quod si aliquando historias & narrationes sacræ Scripturæ, cum id indoctæ plebi expediet, exprimi, & figurari contigerit: doceatur populus, non propterea divinitatem figurari, quasi corporeis oculis conspici, vel coloribus aut figuris exprimi possit. " Moreover, the Catholic Church

Sess. 25. Dec. de Invoc. &c.

" teaches, That the Images of *JESUS CHRIST*,
" of the Blessed Virgin-Mother of God, and of o-
" ther Saints, are to be had and retained, especial-
" ly in Churches; and, that due Honour and Reve-
" rence

" rence is to be given them, not that we believe any
" *Divinity* or *Vertue* to be in them, for which they
" ought to be worſhipped, or that we ought to *ask*
" *any thing of them*, or put our confidence in Ima-
" ges, as the *Pagans* did, who put their truſt in Idols;
" but becauſe the Honour which is paid to them, is
" referred to the Originals which they repreſent:
" So that by means of thoſe Images, which we kiſs,
" and before which we uncover our Heads and Kneel,
" we adore *CHRIST*, and venerate thoſe Saints
" whoſe reſemblance they bear; which Doctrine has
" been taught by the Decrees of Councils againſt
" all Oppugners of Images, eſpecially by the ſecond Conc. Nicen. 2.
" Synod of *Nice*. Actio 3, 4, & 6.

" But above all, let the Biſhop diligently teach,
" That by the Hiſtorical Repreſentations of the My-
" ſteries of our Redemption painted, or expreſſed in
" other forms, the People are taught the Articles of our
" Faith, and confirmed in them by a frequent Com-
" memoration and Recollection; as alſo, That great
" Fruit is reaped from the uſe of all Holy Images; not
" only becauſe the People are admoniſhed by them
" of the Benefits and Gifts which are beſtowed up-
" on them by *JESUS CHRIST*, but alſo becauſe
" the Miracles and ſalutary Examples, which God
" has been pleaſed to ſhew us by his Saints, are viſi-
" bly repreſented to the Faithful, that they may give
" God thanks for them, and may conform their
" Lives and Manners to the Examples of the Saints;
" and may be excited to adore and love God, and
" practiſe Piety. But if any one do teach or think
" contrary to theſe Decrees, let him be *Anathema*.
" But if any Abuſes ſhould chance to creep in a-
" mongſt theſe holy and wholeſom Obſervances,

" the

" the Sacred Synod earneſtly deſires they maybe en-
" tirely aboliſhed; ſo that no Images ſhall be per-
" mitted which may give the ruder People occaſion
" of believing falſe Doctrines or dangerous Errors.
" But if it ſhall ſometimes happen to be expedi-
" ent, for the Inſtruction of the unlearned People,
" to expreſs or figure out ſome Hiſtories or Relati-
" ons of the Holy Scripture, let the People be
" taught the Divinity is not therefore figured to
" them, as if it could be ſeen with our corporal Eyes,
" or expreſſed by Colours or Figures, *&c.* This is our Doctrine; all other Additions or particular Doctrines we are not to anſwer for; and this is what the Biſhop of *Condom* has expreſly taught.

ARTICLE V.

Of Juſtification.

Art. 5. p. 19. IN his Article of Juſtification he tells us, That *the Doctrine of Juſtification is one of thoſe Points that deſerves their careful Conſideration; as being not only one of the chiefeſt of thoſe Points wherein they ſuppoſe the Church of* Rome *to have prevaricated the Faith, but one of the firſt that gave occaſion to that Reformation that was made from it.* If therefore the Doctrine of the Church Catholic, when rightly explicated, be clear from thoſe groſs Apprehenſions they had of it, and be in it ſelf innocent and pure, I hope he will grant the firſt Reformers to have been ſtrangely out in their Meaſures, and that all thoſe, who have followed their Footſteps in that Schiſm, are obliged to return to their Mother-Church.

He

He ſpeaks of *wonderful Extravagances in Pardons, Indulgences, &c.* in former times, and that *generally the People put more confidence in the Inventions of Men, than in the Merits of JESUS CHRIST*; but allows us to be *better inſtructed ſince*, or at leaſt *more cautious*, for which, he ſays, we may *thank the Reformation*. But I believe he will find, that all thoſe ſtrange Extravagances were only the Fictions of their own Brains, and Calumnies raiſed on purpoſe to make us odious; and that if he look into our Councils and Doctors of thoſe Ages, he will find our Doctrines to have always been the ſame and our Practices conformable.

I need not take notice how much he conſents to the Expoſition of the Biſhop of *Condom*, nor of the nice Diſtinction which he gives us betwixt Juſtification and Sanctification, which, he tells us, is the Doctrine of their Church, but, I believe, will be hard put to to prove it; neither need I tell you how much he impoſes upon us, as if we made our inward Righteouſneſs a part of Juſtification, and ſo by conſequence ſaid that our Juſtification it ſelf is wrought alſo by our Good Works: for ſince he tells us, That *were theſe things clearly ſtated and diſtinguiſhed, the difference betwixt us conſidered only in the Idea, would not be very great:* and that they might ſafely *allow whatſoever* M. de Meaux *has advanced upon this Point, provided it be but well and rightly explained*, we need not make any further demur, but go on with him to ſee how the following Doctrines will ſtand upon this Foundation.

ART. VI.

Of Merits.

Art. 6. Pag. 22. HEre he tells us, That if what the Biſhop of *Condom* has explicated, be all the Church of *Rome* aſcribes to Good Works, (that is) *That our Juſtification proceeds abſolutely from Gods Bounty and Mercy, and but accidentally only (in as much as God has tied himſelf by his Word and Promiſe to reward them) from our own performances; they need no long Exhortations to receive a Doctrine which they have always defended.* But he preſently daſhes theſe our hopes of Union, by flying to the particular niceties of the Schools; and thinks it ſufficient to ſhelter the Juſtice of their diſſent in thoſe Particulars from our Accuſations, becauſe ſome of thoſe niceties have not been cenſured by the Church. I need not here ſay any thing more to him than what I have ſaid before, that it is ſufficient the Church has declar'd her Doctrine in the Council of *Trent*, and that the Biſhop of *Meaux* has explicated it accordingly. The niceties of the Schools, when truly repreſented, as they make no Diviſion in the Church, ſo ought they not to make any amongſt Chriſtians.

But however, if this Author had been ſo ingenuous as to have given us the Words or the true Sence of thoſe Authors he cites, the World would have ſeen no ſuch great difference as he pretends there is betwixt them and the Church of *Rome*.

He tells us firſt, That *Maldonate* the *Jeſuit*, upon *Ezek.* 18. 20. ſays, *That we do as truly and properly merit Rewards when we do well, as we do merit Puniſhments when we do ill.* But had he read *Maldonate*,

nate, he would have found his Words, when taken as they lie, to carry with them a very different ſence from what he ſeems to conclude they bear: For being to explicate this part of the twentieth Verſe, *Juſtitia juſti ſuper eum erit, & impietas impii erit ſuper eum; The juſtice of the juſt ſhall be upon him, and the wickedneſs of the wicked ſhall be upon him*; he tells us, *Ex hoc loco perſpicuum eſt, & in nobis aliquam eſſe noſtram ut vocant, inhærentem, propriamque juſtitiam, quamvis ex Dei Gratia, & largitate profectam: & nos tam proprie, ac verè* cum Gratia Dei *bene agentes præmia mereri, quam ſine illa male agentes ſupplicia meremur. De præmio enim juſti, & ſupplicio impii eodem prorſus modo loquitur*: i. e. "From this Paſſage it is very clear, both "that there is in us an Inherent, as they call it, and "Proper Juſtice of our own, altho' proceeding from "the Grace and Bounty of God: as alſo, that we do "as properly and truly when we do well TOGE-"THER WITH THE GRACE OF GOD merit "a Reward, as we do merit Puniſhments when we "do ill WITHOUT IT. For he ſpeaks here after "the very ſame manner of the Juſt Man's Reward, "and of the Puniſhment of the Wicked. Theſe are his Words: but our Author, whoſe Religion, as he tells us, *accuſtoms him to ſincerity*, had it may be forgot himſelf a little here, or read it in haſt, or copied it from ſome other Author, upon whoſe ſincerity he relied, which made him leave out theſe words, *Together with the Grace of God.*

His next Quotation is from *Bellarmine*, who tells us, ſays he, *That our Good Works do merit Eternal Life condignly, not by reaſon of God's Covenant and Acceptation, but alſo by reaſon of the Work it ſelf.* De Juſtif. lib 5. c. 17.

The Title indeed of that Chapter is ſomething towards that ſence; for the Words are theſe: *Opera bona juſtorum meritoria eſſe ex condigno, non ſolum ratione pacti, ſed etiam ratione operis*; "The Works "of the Juſt are condignly meritorious, not only by "reaſon of God's Covenant, but alſo by reaſon of "the Works. But if we look into the Chapter it ſelf, we ſhall ſee his Sence, and that he only holds a Scholaſtic Opinion, as moſt probable, and one not ſo inconſiſtent with the Doctrine of the Church as he would have it, nor ſo erroneous as that it needs an *Index Expurgatorius*.

He tells us firſt, There are *three ways by which Good Works may be condignly meritorious; either by reaſon of the Covenant alone, or by reaſon of the Work alone, or upon account of them both together.* Then he tells us, That ſeveral Authors have held ſome one and ſome another of theſe ways; but he himſelf will keep the middle, *as moſt probable*, and ſhew, That *the Good Works of the Juſt are condignly meritorious of Eternal Life, not only by reaſon of the Covenant, but alſo of the Work together with it.* And in proving this Aſſertion, he explicates his meaning, and ſhews, firſt, That *the Good Works of the Juſt, taken of themſelves alone, without that Covenant, are not condignly, or ſo rigorouſly meritorious of Eternal Life, that God could not without an Injuſtice refuſe ſuch a Reward*: And ſecondly, *That in Good Works, proceeding from Grace, there is a certain Proportion and Equality to the Reward of Eternal Life*: becauſe *Eternal Life is, as St.* John *tells us*, GRACE FOR GRACE; *that is, the Grace of a Reward, for the Grace of Merit:* becauſe *Grace is* SEMEN GLORIÆ, *the Seed of Glory:* and becauſe *our Me-*

John 1. 16.

rits

rits depend upon the Merits of CHRIST, both in this, that he has merited for us the Vertue of Meriting; and in this, that we merit, as the Living Members of JESUS CHRIST, and by an Influence which we receive from him as from our Head. So that he concludes from theſe and ſeveral other Reaſons brought by him (all of which ſhew he do's not underſtand that either our Works can be called Good, or we be eſteemed Juſt, without the Grace of God) I ſay, from theſe he concludes, That it would be *to detract from the Glory of CHRIST, that our Merits* (which receive all their Value from him) *ſhould be ſo imperfect, as not to be condignly meritorious, unleſs it were* purely *by reaſon of God's Acceptance.* Now let any impartial Man be judge whether this Doctrine require ſo ſevere a Cenſure as he would have the Church to give upon it.

Then he brings in *Vaſquez*, whoſe Doctrine is much what the ſame as *Bellarmine*'s, as to the firſt of the three Concluſions brought by him. The ſecond, as appears by the Words, is only a pure Scholaſtic Diſpute about a Poſſibility: and therefore I need ſay nothing to them. As for his third, after ſome ſearch, I could not find any Concluſion bearing that ſence. But touching his *Remarkable Corollary*, I muſt needs tell him, he has been ſo diſingenuous as to leave out thoſe Parts which would have ſhewn his Reader upon what Matter he was treating, and how little it made for his purpoſe, or againſt us. But that he may ſee I love ſincere Dealing, tho' I be no Proteſtant, I will tranſcribe his Words.

In D. Th. 1. 2. qu. 114. d. 214. c. 5. & alibi.

At vero cum opera Juſti condigne mereantur vitam æternam tanquam æqualem mercedem, & præmium, non opus eſt interventa alterius meriti condigni, quale

qnale eſt meritum Chriſti, ut eis reddatur vita æterna, quinimo aliquid habet peculiare meritum cujuſcunque juſti reſpectu ipſius hominis juſti, quod non habet meritum Chriſti, nempe reddere ipſum hominem juſtum, & dignum vitâ æternâ, ut eam dignè conſequatur; meritum autem Chriſti, licet digniſſimum ſit quod obtineat a Deo Gratiam pro nobis, tamen non habet hanc efficaciam & virtutem, ut reddat nos formaliter juſtos, & dignos æternâ vitâ, ſed per virtutem ab ipſo derivatam hunc conſequuntur effectum homines in ſe ipſis. Et ita nunquam petimus a Deo per merita Chriſti, ut noſtris dignis operibus & meritoriis reddatur merces æternæ vitæ, ſed ut per Chriſtum detur nobis Gratia qua poſſumus dignè hanc mercedem promereri, quod etiam manifeſtum ſignum eſt non expectare nos novam imputationem meritorum Chriſti, *præter eam, qua initio accepimus gratiam, & virtutem ad recte operandum, & condigne promerendum.— Nam cum dicimus Chriſtum meruiſſe nobis vitam æternam, non intelligimus illam ita nobis meruiſſe, ut noſtris operibus & meritis condignis non reddatur, niſi* poſteriori illa applicatione meritorum Chriſti, *ſed quia Chriſtus merito ſuo obtinuit nobis juſtificationem, & ea omnia, quibus ad illam præparamur, & præterea obtinuit jam juſtificatis auxilia, quibus recte operarentur, & vitam æternam promererentur.*

" But (ſays he) ſeeing the Works of the Juſt do " condignly merit Eternal Life, as an equal Recom- " pence and Reward, there is no need that any " other Condign Merit, ſuch as that of *CHRIST*, " ſhould interpoſe, to the end that Eternal Life " might be rendred to them; for the Merit of every " Juſt man has ſomething peculiar in reſpect of him- " ſelf, who is Juſt, which the Merit of *CHRIST* " has

"has not, that is, to render him Juſt, and worthy "of Eternal Life, that he may worthily obtain it; "whereas the Merit of *CHRIST*, tho' it be moſt "worthy to obtain Grace for us from God, yet it "has not this Efficacy and Power to render us for- "mally Juſt, and worthy of Eternal Life; but Men "do in themſelves, *by a Virtue deriv'd from Him*, "obtain this Effect. And thus we never beg of God "that by the Merits of *CHRIST* the Reward of "Eternal Life may be given to our Worthy and Me- "ritorious Works; but that through *CHRIST* "Grace may be given us, whereby we may be en- "abled worthily to merit this Reward, which is alſo "a manifeſt ſign that we do not expect a *new Impu- "tation of the Merits of CHRIST, beſides that by "which we at firſt received Grace and Strength to "operate rightly, and merit worthily.* — For when "we ſay, that *CHRIST* has merited Eternal Life "for us, we do not underſtand it as if he merited it ſo "for us, that it would not be rendred to our Good "Works and condign Merits, unleſs by that *ſucceed- "ing Application of the Merits of CHRIST*; but "becauſe *CHRIST by his Merits has obtain'd Juſtifi- "cation for us, and all other things by which we are "prepared to it, and moreover obtained for them who "are already juſtified thoſe Helps by which they might "rightly operate, and merit Eternal Life.*

From which laſt Words, and the others left out by this Author, it appears manifeſtly, that *Vaſquez* was not diſputing whether we merited Grace and Glory of our own ſelves, without the Aſſiſtance of the Grace of *JESUS CHRIST*; but whether, after that *JESUS CHRIST* had merited for us Juſtifying Grace, and all other Helps neceſſary to make

our

our Works good, acceptable, and meritorious, there was ſtill another Grace of *JESUS CHRIST* required over and above theſe his other Aſſiſtances, without which we could not obtain Eternal Life.

Pag. 23. Is this that *Doctrine* then which he ſays *they moſt juſtly deteſt, and are not a little ſurprized to finde that no* Index Expurgatorius, *no Authentic Cenſure has ever taken notice of ſo dangerous a Prevarication?* Or rather are they not his own Prevarications, which he has put upon us as our Doctrines, and which are as deteſtable to us, as they are to him; nay, more, if he thinks theſe Authors held it poſſible for us to merit of our ſelves, without the Grace of God, which prevents, accompanies, and Crowns all our Actions: for he acknowledges, that ſuch a Doctrine of Merit as that which he has repreſented, as theirs would at leaſt juſtifie a Diſſent from a Church in thoſe Particulars, tho' it would not engage them wholly to forſake a Church that taught ſuch things; whereas we doubt not to ſay, That it cannot be a True Church which teaches ſuch Erroneous Doctrines, and therefore that we ought not to communicate with ſuch an one.

ART. VII.

Satisfactions, Purgatory and Indulgences.

Art. 7. p. 24. HIs next Article is of *Satisfactions*. In which he confeſſes, that what the Biſhop of *Meaux* has

Pag. 25. ſaid *they could moſt readily allow of, were there but any tolerable Arguments to eſtabliſh the Doctrine that*

Pag. 27. *requires it*. He tells us alſo, that they *practice that Diſcipline for many other benefits of it, and wiſh it were univerſally eſtabliſhed even in a ſtrictneſs equal to what it is fallen from*: But yet he will impoſe upon us a belief, that by our own endeavours

vours we *are able to make a true and proper ſatisfaction to God for ſin.* How do's he prove it? Or how do's he ſhew that the Council of *Trent* is contrary to the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s Expoſition? He tells us indeed, that the Council of *Trent* declares, *That the Juſtice of God requires it, and that therefore the Confeſſors ſhould be charged to proportion the Satisfaction to the Crime*; which he thinks is more than what the Biſhop had explicated when he affirm'd, *That the neceſſity of this payment do's not ariſe from any defect in Chriſts Satisfaction, but from a certain Order which God has eſtabliſhed for a wholſome Diſcipline, and to keep us from offending*; and tells us, that *Bellarmine* concludes from theſe words of the Council, *that it is we who properly ſatisfie for our own ſins, and that Chriſts Satisfaction ſerves only to make ours Valid*; and cites in the Margin, *Lib.* 1. *de Purg. c.* 14. whereas there are but eleven Chapters in that Book.

Ibidem. Pag. 26. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. c. 8.

But that you may ſee how juſt he is in his Accuſation of the Council of *Trent*, I will give you the words of it.

The Council having declar'd the neceſſity of Satisfactions both from various Examples of Scripture, in which it appears manifeſtly, that God ſometimes remits the guilt of Sin, and yet retains a Puniſhment, as alſo from the *Juſtice of God which ſeems to exact a ſeverer puniſhment for Sins* committed againſt a *greater Grace and Knowledge* than for Sins committed *through Ignorance before Baptiſm*: And having alſo declared the uſe and benefits of Penitential Works, to form in us a true Senſe of the Enormity of Sin, to be as a Curb to keep us from ſinning, and as a Medicine to heal the remnants of Sin, and conquer evil habits, and to render us conformable to our

Gen. 3. 2 King. 12. Numb. 12, & 20.

Head CHRIST JESUS, *with whom, if we ſuffer,* (a) *we ſhall raign alſo,* adds theſe words, *Neque vero ita noſtra eſt ſatisfactio hæc, quam pro peccatis noſtris exſolvimus, ut non ſit per* CHRISTUM JESUM: *nam qui ex nobis, tanquam ex nobis, nihil poſſumus, eo cooperante, qui nos confortat, omnia poſſumus. Ita non habet homo unde glorietur; ſed omnis gloriatio noſtra in Chriſto eſt: in quo vivimus, in quo meremur, in quo ſatisfacimus, facientes fructus dignos Pœnitentiæ, qui ex illo vim habent: ab illo offerunt Patri, & per illum acceptantur a Patre. Debent ergo Sacerdotes Domini, quantum Spiritus & prudentia ſuggerit, pro qualitate criminum, & Pœnitentium facultate, ſalutares & convenientes ſatisfactiones injungere: ne ſi forte peccatis conniveant, & indulgentius cum Pœnitentibus agant, lævißima quædam opera pro graviſſimis delictis injungendo, alienorum peccatorum participes efficiantur.*

(a) Rom. 8. 17. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. c. 8.

"But this Satisfaction which we make for our Sins, "is not ſo ours, that it is not JESUS CHRIST's; for we "who (b) of our ſelves, as of our ſelves can do nothing, "can do all things with him who ſtrengthens us. So "that Man hath nothing wherein to glory: (c) But "all our glory is in *Chriſt*, in whom (d) we live, in "whom we merit, and in whom we ſatisfie, bring- "ing forth (e) Fruits worthy of Repentance, which "have their Power from him: By him are offered "to his Father. *From all which the Council concludes "thus*, Therefore the Prieſts of our Lord ought, as "Prudence and the Spirit of God ſhall dictate, to en- "joyn ſalutary and convenient Satisfactions, accord- "ing to the Quality of the Crimes, and the Abilities "of the Penitents, leaſt if they ſhould chance to con- "nive at Sins, and be too indulgent to Penitents, by "enjoyning light Penances for great Offences, they "ſhould

(b) 2 Cor. 3. 5. Phil. 4. 13.
(c) 1 Cor. 1. 31. 2 Cor. 10. 17. Gal. 6. 3.
(d) Acts 17. 28.
(e) Matth. 3. 8. 4. 17. Luc. 3. 8. 10. & 17.

" ſhould be made partakers of the Sins of others.

Is not this the very Senſe of the Biſhop of *Meaux*? And what proof can he bring from hence, that we think we can of our ſelves *make a true and proper ſatisfaction to God for Sin* as he inſinuates.

I would gladly therefore have this Author, and with him all Proteſtants to conſider whether what he ſays be a ſufficient ground to break off from an eſtabliſh'd Church, and ſeparate from her Communion. All the Authority he brings is, *We think the whole of this point to be the advancement of a Doctrine grounded upon no Authority of Scripture*, &c. and we *are perſuaded*, that when ever God remits the Crime he remits the Puniſhment alſo, it being a way *moſt ſuitable to his Divine Goodneſs*. He tells us indeed, that this is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, but cites no Authority of Canons or Articles for it, which is very ſtrange, ſeeing this Doctrine is of ſuch concern, that it gives more to a Sinner for ſaying a bare *Lord have Mercy upon us*, than all the *Plenary Indulgences* of the Catholic Church, againſt which they make ſuch clamours. Pag. 24. Pag. 25.

And here alſo I cannot but wonder, that he who ſo often uſes no other Argument but *we are perſuaded*, *we think*, *we ſuppoſe*, that in almoſt every Article he brings this as his chiefeſt Argument, we *ſuppoſe this is contrary to Scripture*; *or we think this is not to be found in it or in Antiquity*; ſhould yet quarrel with the Biſhop of *Meaux* for uſing that word, and tell us, he ought to have brought ſome better proof for ſo great a Doctrine than barely *we ſuppoſe*: And this, eſpecially, when the Biſhop did not uſe the word, but only *nous croyons*, *we believe*, and ſo it was rendred by me. But it matters not, this Pag. 25.

Pag 25,27,31. ſerved to make a ſhew of an Argument, and muſt be improved upon ſeveral occaſions.

Indulgences.

Art. 7. pag. 27. INdulgences follow next. And here he tells us, That the Biſhop of *Meaux has ſtated our Doctrine after a manner ſo favourable to them, that he is perſuaded he will find more in his own Church than in theirs to oppoſe his Doctrine.* We do not hear of any one yet that has oppoſed it; nay, on the contrary, we ſee it almoſt every where approved. If the Diſputes in the Schools have deſcended to ſome particular Niceties not expreſſed by the Biſhop, neither he nor we are concerned in them; and if ſome Abuſes have crept in, ſeeing he acknowledges that *both the*

Pag. 28. *Council and the Biſhop of* Meaux *ſeem willing to have them redreſſed*, methinks it ſhould ſuffice.

He tells us indeed of many Practices in the Church of *Rome* different (as he ſays) from that of the Primitive Church; but theſe being neither neceſſary, nor univerſally received, we will not quarrel with him about them, but content our ſelves with what he has promiſed, if he will ſtand to his word, That *whenever the Penances ſhall be reduc'd to their former Practice, they will be ready to give or receive ſuch an Indulgence as* Monſieur de Meaux *has deſcribed, and as the Primitive Ages of the Church allowed of.*

Purgatory.

Art. 2. THo' he will not allow a Purgatory, yet he is forced to acknowledge Prayer for the Dead

in

in the very ſecond Century. He would willingly attribute this to any other Intention than that of the Church of aiding or helping Souls departed; nay, further he tells us, they will not condemn the Practice, ſo it be not made an Article of our Faith. But ſince two General Councils have declared it, that of *Florence*, in which the *Grecian* Biſhops were, and that of *Trent*; and ſince the Practice of all Nations, and the Teſtimonies of every Age confirm the Cuſtom of Praying for the Dead that they might receive help; what can we ſay to them, who make a Breach in the Church, and condemn Antiquity upon no other grounds than a bare ſuppoſition, that it is injurious to the Merits of *JESUS CHRIST*, which yet has no other Proof but their vain Preſumption. Pag. 31. Pag. 32.

ART. VIII.

Of the Sacraments in general.

IN his ſecond Part he tells us, "That the Doctrine "of the Sacraments has always been eſteemed "one of the *moſt conſiderable Obſtacles* to their "Union with the Church of *Rome*; That they can- "not imagine why *M. de Meaux* ſhould inſinuate as "if our Diſputes about theſe, except it be in the "Point of the Euchariſt, were not ſo great as about "other Matters, unleſs (ſays he) it be to ſerve for "an Excuſe for his own paſſing ſo lightly over them, "or to make us leſs careful in examining their Do- "ctrine. Art. 9. pag. 31.

One would think, to hear this Diſcourſe, that this Author had ſomething very material to bring againſt our Church; neither has he given us any reaſon to ſuſpect

ſuſpect he would be careleſs in ſuch a grand Concern: We will trace him in each Sacrament, and ſee whether the Arguments he brings be ſufficient or no to juſtifie a Breach in the Church, which has been the occaſion of ſo great Evils.

And firſt, in this Article we find little difference betwixt our Doctrines as to the Nature and Efficacy of the Sacraments, or as to the Neceſſity of them, or manner how they confer Grace, or the Diſpoſitions requiſite to partake of their Effects; the chief difference lying in the diverſity of Expreſſion.

And as for the number of Sacraments, he has removed the chief Obſtacle, by telling us, in the cloſe of this Article, That *their own Church ſays but little more than what our greateſt Schoolmen have voluntarily confeſſed.* But he needed not to have gone to the Schoolmen; for if they exact this Notion of a Sacrament, that it muſt be *generally neceſſary to Salvation*, as their Catechiſm expreſſes it, 'tis true, they will not find Seven Sacraments; but I am afraid alſo they will ſcarce eſtabliſh Two: and if they add, with this Author, that the other Sacraments are not
pag. 41. Sacraments *after the ſame manner that Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are*, it will be readily granted them, ſeeing the very Words of our Profeſſion of Faith expreſs much-what the ſame thing, when it tells us, there are *Seven Sacraments of the New Law Inſtituted by JESUS CHRIST for the Salvation of Mankind, tho' all be not neceſſary for every Man.*

If the number of Seven Sacraments be not mentioned by the Ancient Fathers, it is no wonder, ſeeing they writ not Catechiſms; but neither do they limit them to Two: It is ſufficient, that in diſcourſing upon any of theſe Seven, they generally and properly

perly call them Sacraments. Neither can any Argument drawn from Scripture, againſt this Number, be of force, ſince the Scripture do's not term any of them Sacraments but only Marriage. It is ſufficient, that the Scripture mentions an exteriour Ceremony, and an interiour Grace annexed thereto, which ſhews the nature of a Sacrament. Eph. 5.

ART. IX.

Of Baptiſm.

AS for Baptiſm, we both agree, That *it is the Law of Chriſt, which the Eternal Truth has eſtabliſhed, that ſeeing all men are conceived and born in Sin, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of Water and the Spirit.* What reaſon therefore they have to break Communion with an eſtabliſhed Church, becauſe ſhe will not be more Charitable than *JESUS CHRIST, whoſe Law this is*, I cannot underſtand. Art. 10. p. 35.

But (ſays he) This Law, as well as others, muſt be interpreted according to the Rules of Natural Equity; and ſince the *Roman* Church acknowledges that God ſometimes accepts of the Will for the Deed, the ardent Deſire of Baptiſm for Baptiſm it ſelf, when it cannot be had; why ſhould we not think he will accept of the Deſire of the Church, and of the Believing Parents, to ſatisfie for the want of Baptiſm in Children who die without it, ſeeing St. *Paul* tells us, That *the Seed of faithful Parentage is Holy from the very Birth.* 1 Cor. 7.

I muſt confeſs I am aſtoniſhed to ſee this Argument, and to hear the Church condemned for her Uncharitable-

Uncharitableneſs in this Point, by one who pretends to give us the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; whereas ſhe *determines nothing of it*, as he confeſſes. If he had been a *Huguenot*, or *Puritan*, it might have ſeemed reaſonable to juſtifie a Breach with the Church of *Rome* for a Doctrine which they condemn: But for a Church of *England* Man to juſtifie a Breach for a Doctrine which he affirms his Church has determined nothing of, is to me a Riddle, but ſhews how little he eſteems the Sin of Schiſm.

Pag. 37.

Certainly there is a vaſt difference betwixt the ardent Deſire of thoſe who are by Age capable of receiving Baptiſm, and the Deſire of the Church or Parents: The one proceeds from Faith working by Divine Charity, already infuſed into the Soul of the Unbaptized Perſon, which if he extinguiſh not by the neglect of a Precept, will no doubt of it produce a good Effect: The other is wholly extrinſecal to the Child, and cannot affect the Soul of it, unleſs by the application of that Sacrament which by the Inſtitution of *JESUS CHRIST* muſt waſh away our Original Guilt.

So is there alſo a vaſt difference betwixt a Legal Purity, of which St. *Paul* ſpeaks in the above-mentioned Text, and a Cleanneſs from Original Sin, of which we treat.

ART.

ART. X.

Confirmation.

"HE acknowledges Confirmation, or Impoſition "on of Hands upon thoſe who had been "Baptiz'd, to have been very Antient in the Church, "and which the very Apoſtles themſelves practis'd; "as alſo that the uſe of Chriſm in Confirmation was "very antient. He tells us, they allow none that "is not of Epiſcopal Order to Confirm, and that "they piouſly hope the Bleſſing of the Holy Spirit "deſcends upon thoſe who receive it through the "Prayer of the Biſhop, to enable them to keep their "Baptiſmal Covenant, to Arm them againſt Tem-"ptations, and to aſſiſt them in the way of *Vertue* "*and Religion*, &c. All which ſhew an outward viſible Sign, of an inward Spiritual Grace; and the Divine Inſtitution of this Sacrament; ſeeing none but God can promiſe Grace to an outward Sign; ſuch as the Impoſition of Hands and Chriſm are: and certainly ſtrength to keep our Baptiſmal Covenant, to reſiſt Temptations and to practice Vertue are no ſmall Graces, which he, at leaſt, piouſly hopes are granted by God, through the Prayer of the Biſhop; he might have added Impoſition of Hands alſo; and ſhould have given us a reaſon why they left off the uſe of Chriſm, which he grants was early in the Church, and why they will not call this a Sacrament, which has all theſe marks of it, and which the Antient Fathers frequently termed ſo: But if he will have it only to be a Sacrament not ſo *generally neceſſary to Salvation* as ſome others are, we will not

Art. 11. pag. 39, 40.

 diſpute

diſpute about the name under ſo ſtrict a notion, tho' we affirm it to be a *Sacrament properly ſpeaking.*

ART. XI.

Of Penance and Confeſſion.

Art. 12. p. 40. "HE wiſhes their Diſcipline were both more "ſtrictly required, and more duly obſerv'd "as to Penance and Confeſſion than it is. He tells "us that their Canons require perhaps as much as "the Primitive Chriſtians themſelves did, but that "it proceeds from the decay of Piety in the People "rather than any want of care in their Church, "that they are not as well and as regularly pra-"ctiſed.

He cannot deny but that Confeſſion both public and private were very antiently practis'd both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches; but ſuppoſes them to have been only a part of Chriſtian Diſcipline: and therefore tells us, the Primitive Chriſtians interpreted theſe Paſſages cited by the Biſhop of Matth. 18. 18. Joh. 20. 23. *Meaux*, with reſpect to Public Diſcipline: If he had produced thoſe Fathers, and ſhown that they taught it to be only the Orders of a Public Diſcipline of the Church, and not an obligation upon a Sinner either to confeſs publicly or privately to the Prieſt, (which was ſometimes called Confeſſion to God, as Abſolution was called Abſolution from God) it would have been ſome ſatisfaction to the Reader.

He inſinuates as if we permitted *every Prieſt* to hear Confeſſions, and only *juſt to hear them, and* Pag. 41. *then without any more ado to ſay, I ABSOLVE THEE:* But this it is not to underſtand our Diſcipline,

pline, which permits none to hear Confeſſions but ſuch as are approv'd of, after a diligent examen of their Learning and Capacity, that they may be not only as Judges to paſs a right Sentence upon the Enormity of the Crimes, the various ſpecies of them, the Obligations of Reſtitution, &c. but alſo as Phyſicians to preſcribe wholeſome Remedies to prevent Relapſes, &c. which cannot be done without the knowledge of the Caſe.

And therefore, tho' we aſſert the great convenience of Private or Auricular Confeſſion, to take away the occaſions of Fear, Shame and Scandal; yet our Diſpute is not ſo much upon that, as upon a neceſſity of declaring our Sins to a Spiritual Phyſician, which whether it be publicly or privately matters not, ſo it be done; and without doing which, we ſay, neither can a Judge pronounce a juſt Sentence, nor a Phyſician preſcribe wholeſome Remedies.

We grant therefore, that Public Confeſſion was much in uſe in the Primitive Church for Public Sins, and that it was follow'd with a Public Penance for them; but that was moſt commonly either after, or accompanied with Private Confeſſion of their Secret Sins alſo. That this Public Confeſſion was a part of Diſcipline, and therefore alterable at pleaſure, we deny not, but that either Public or Private Confeſſion were neceſſary, we affirm.

He tells us, *That the Church of* England *refuſes no ſort of Confeſſion either Public or Private, which may be any ways neceſſary to the quieting of Mens Conſciences; or to the exerciſing of that Power of binding and looſing, which our Saviour* CHRIST *has left to his Church.* That her *Abſolution is ſo full, that the Church of* Rome *it ſelf could not deſire to add any* Pag. 42. Pag. 43.

thing to it. That they *Adviſe* even *Private Confeſſion upon many accounts which the Biſhop of Meaux has remarked, and which they willingly allow as very uſeful to the Penitent*; that is, I ſuppoſe, he allows with the Biſhop the Penitential Court of Judicature
Expoſ. pag. 18. *to be a curb to Liberty, a plentiful ſourſe of Wiſe Admonitions, and a ſenſible conſolation for Souls afflicted for their Sins*; all which he acknowledges render it very uſeful, and convenient even to thoſe who have no *doubt nor ſcruple.* But yet he will not have this ſo beneficial an exerciſe to be *neceſſary*, where the Sinner can *quiet his Conſcience* without it; but calls it an *unneceſſary Rack to Mens Conſciences*: So that if a Man be either inſenſible of his Sins, or have brought his Conſcience to ſuch a paſs, that it checks him not, or be preſumptious of Gods Mercies, and upon that think himſelf ſecure of a Pardon, it ſeems it is not neceſſary with them he ſhould either have that *Curb*, or thoſe *Admonitions*; whereas we think thoſe Perſons have moſt need of all the helps imaginable; and doubt not but that God, who gave ſo large a Commiſſion to his Prieſt to bind or looſe, did not exempt thoſe who ſtand in need of it from a due ſubmiſſion to that Tribunal.

We affirm therefore that Penance is neceſſary, not for every Man in particular, but to thoſe only who have offended mortally after Baptiſm: That true Contrition, which muſt vertually include all the parts of it, is ſufficient in caſe of a non-poſſibility of performing ſome of them: That Confeſſion which is one of the parts of it, either public or private, is neceſſary to be performed to a Prieſt, that they who have Authority to bind or looſe may know upon what it is they are to pronounce Sentence: That tho' our Sentence

tence be abſolute, yet ſince we cannot know when the Penitent has thoſe due Diſpoſitions which are required to receive the Benefit of it; neither alſo can we be ſure that God always confirms our Sentence.

Theſe are our Doctrines, this we have always held and practis'd, and this we affirm to be conformable to the practice of the moſt Antient and Orthodox Churches; and we cannot but be aſtoniſhed why they ſhould be rejected and no better grounds brought than *we ſuppoſe*, or *we muſt beg leave with aſſurance to ſay, that* ſuch Doctrines *are directly contrary to the Tradition of the Church, and to many plain and undoubted places of Holy Scripture.* It he ſay, he only undertook an Expoſition of their Doctrine, and therefore was no more oblig'd to prove it than the Biſhop of *Meaux* himſelf; I muſt tell him, the difference is great; for the Biſhop of *Meaux* undertaking to Expound a Doctrine eſtabliſh'd in the Church, that very Poſſeſſion was a ſufficient proof of its Antiquity and Univerſality; it being a conſtant maxim in our Church, that no particular Opinions or Practiſes ought ever to be eſtabliſh'd as neceſſary to all; and that nothing can be declared as an Article of our Faith, which was not materially ſo before, that is, which was not handed down to us by univerſal Tradition as a reveal'd Truth: Whereas this Author undertaking to give us an Expoſition of a Doctrine which diſſents from ours ſo eſtabliſh'd, and of which we are in poſſeſſion, if he would have it bear any weight, he ought to have given ſome ſolid Reaſons for their defection from thoſe Doctrines, which had been eſtabliſh'd in *England* for above a Thouſand Years, from the very time that Pagan Idolatry was rooted out by St. *Auguſtin* the *Benedictin* Monk,

Pag. 43.

Monk; he ought, I ſay, to have given ſome ſolid Reaſons, ſuch as were no leſs than Domonſtrations, or manifeſt Revelations, to which, and to no other, thoſe who are in Poſſeſſion of a Doctrine ſo eſtabliſh'd ought to ſubmit, and without which all Arguments for a Reformation dwindle into this which is very inefficacious; we *ſuppoſe we have a juſt reaſon to reform; we think we are in the right; we are perſuaded it is according to Scripture*, &c. *but we are not certain.*

ART. XII.

Of Extream Unction.

Art. 13. p. 44. AS to the Sacrament of *Extream Unction*, this Author cannot deny but the words of St. *James*,

James 5. 14, 15. *If any man be ſick, let him call for the Prieſts of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyl in the Name of our Lord. And the prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and our Lord ſhall lift him up: and if he be in ſins, they ſhall be remitted to him:* I ſay, he cannot deny, but theſe words exhibit to us an outward Viſible Sign, and an Inward Spiritual Grace: but yet he will not have the meaning of this Paſſage to refer at all to a Sacrament, but only to the miraculous Cures of the Apoſtles, contrary to the expreſs words of Scripture, and to the ſence of them received and delivered to us by Antiquity.

The Grace of Curing the Sick was not given to all Prieſts or Elders alike, but only to ſome ſelect Perſons; theſe did not only cure the Sick, but the Lame and the Blind; their Power of Miracles was not

not tied to the Ceremony of Unction only; all thoſe that were anointed were not cured; neither had all they who were cured by them who had the Gift of Healing, any aſſurance, by that Cure, of the Forgiveneſs of their Sins: Yet St. *James* here ſpeaks of thoſe only that are Sick; he appoints them to call in the Prieſts in general, and not them only who had the Gift of Healing; he ſpeaks only of anointing them with Oyl, and not of any other Ceremonies, uſed by *CHRIST* or his Apoſtles, in order to the curing of the Sick. He promiſes, *The prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and the Lord ſhall lift him up*; which, if it had been meant of Bodily Health, thoſe only would have died in the Apoſtles time, who either neglected this Advice, or whoſe Deaths prevented the accompliſhment of that Ceremony: And laſtly, he pronounces, That *if they be in ſins, they ſhall be remitted*; which ſhews plainly enough, it cannot belong only to Bodily Cures, as he would have it.

But he tells us, The *Rituals of the* Roman *Church, for above Eight hundred years, underſtood it plainly of Bodily Cures, and that Cardinal* Cajetan *himſelf freely confeſſes, that it can belong to no other.* Had he only told us, that the ancient *Roman* Rituals ſhew this Ceremony had a reſpect to Bodily Cures, as well as to the Cures of the Mind, he had told us nothing but what our Rituals at this day manifeſt, and what may be gathered from the Council of *Trent*, as the Biſhop of *Meaux* obſerves; which ſpeaking of the Effects of this Sacrament, tells us, That the Sick Perſon do's ſometimes by it obtain Health of Body, when it is expedient for the Salvation of the Soul. Had he told us alſo only, that

Seſſ. 14. de Sac. Extrem. Unc. cap. 2.

Cardinal

Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu verba hæc loquuntur de Sacramentali Unctione Extremæ Unctionis: sed magis de Unctione quam instituit Dominus JESUS, a discipulis exercendam in ægrotis. *Cajet. Annot. in loc.*

Cardinal *Cajetan* thought *it could not be proved, neither from the Words, nor from the Effect, that the Words of St.* James *speak of the Sacramental Unction of Extream Unction; but rather of that Unction which our Lord* JESUS *instituted in the Gospel, to be exercised by his Disciples upon the Sick,* he had been a faithful Quoter of *Cajetan*'s Sence: But to tell us, he freely confesses *it can belong to no other,* is to impose upon him and his Readers.

He tells us, *They anoint not their Sick for the Recovery of their Bodily Health, because the Miraculous Power of Healing, to which that Ceremony ministred, is ceased in the Church.* But unless he can manifestly prove, that Unction had no relation to the Sicknesses of the Soul, and this from clearer Testimonies than the continued Practice of the Church till this last Age, he brings nothing against our Possession, nor can he justifie the laying it aside.

ART. XIII.

Of Marriage.

Art. 14 p. 45. HE tells us concerning Marriage, *That* M. de Meaux *says nothing of it, but what they willingly allow:* and we desire no more. He supposes,

Pag. 46. that all *true and proper Sacraments ought to be generally necessary to Salvation;* and *after the same manner a Sacrament, as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are;* and cites *Lombard* quoted by *Cassander* on their side: But this, I suppose, was only for ostentation; for no Catholics ever esteemed Marriage to be a Sacrament *generally necessary to Salvation;* otherwise, as he grants himself, they would never have prohibited the

the Uſe of it to the Clergy. But if he intend his Quotations ſhould refer to the Reaſon he gives why it cannot be a Sacrament after the ſame manner that Baptiſm and the Holy Euchariſt are, *becauſe* (as he ſays) *it wants an Outward Sign, to which by CHRIST's Promiſe a Bleſſing is annex'd*, he will not only find this Author againſt him, but the whole Torrent of the Fathers, and the plain Texts of Scripture as interpreted by them.

ART. XIV.

Of Holy Orders.

HE tells us, That *the Impoſition of Hands in Holy Orders, being accompanied with a Bleſſing of the Holy Spirit, may perhaps upon that account be called a kind of particular Sacrament*; but becauſe the Grace that is conferred by it is not common to all Chriſtians, he *thinks it ought not to be eſteemed a common Sacrament of the whole Church, as Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are.* So that thus far I find no difference betwixt us. Art. 15. p. 46.

He tells us alſo, That they will not raiſe any Controverſie about the diſtinction of Orders below Deacons; becauſe he acknowledges them to be ancient in the Church: and I am ſatisfied with that Acknowledgment, and would not willingly raiſe new Diſputes.

ART. XV.

Of the Euchariſt.

Art. 16. p. 47. WE come now to the Article of the Euchariſt, in which we cannot but with him teſtifie our juſt regret, that this Sacrament of Love and Charity ſhould become now an Occaſion of Contention.

It is not my Province to examine the Arguments he brings againſt our Doctrine, they having been ſo often and ſo fully anſwered by others; or to ſhew how weakly he oppugns the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Reaſons; but only to juſtifie his Expoſition. Yet however I cannot but take notice how inſincerely he begins his Attaque, from whence we may judge what is to be expected in the Sequel.

He tells us, That *M. de Meaux* ſeems to allow, that in two Caſes it might have been lawful to forſake the Literal Interpretation of theſe Words, *This is my Body:* The firſt is, *If there be ſuch grounds in thoſe Words for a Figurative Interpretation, as naturally lead to it.* Which having ſuppoſed to be granted by the Biſhop, he undertakes to prove from *Gratian* and *Bellarmine*, that the Words do lead to a Figurative Interpretation; and endeavours to confirm it by the Words of the Inſtitution, and other Examples of Scripture. But what will he ſay now, when I ſhall ſhew him, that he impoſes upon the Biſhop, and has not proved one tittle either againſt him or us?

Ibidem.

Expoſ. pag. 19. The Biſhop's Words are theſe: *As for us, who find nothing in the Words which JESUS CHRIST makes uſe*

uſe of in the Inſtitution of this Myſtery, OBLIGING US to take them in a Figurative Sence, we think that a ſufficient Reaſon to determine us to the Literal. He ſpeaks here, you ſee, of our being *OBLIGED to take thoſe Words in a Figurative ſence*, which both he and all Catholics affirm can never be proved againſt us; but no body ever denied but the Words as they lie (without conſidering the Circumſtances, and Practice of the Church delivering the Interpretation of them down to us) might poſſibly lead to a Figurative Interpretation, ſeeing the like Expreſſions are frequently found in Scripture: as, for example, *I am a Door, I am a Vine, &c.* which being always taken by the Church in a Figurative ſence, we ſhould eſteem him a Madman that ſhould think it poſſible after this to perſuade all the World they ought to be taken in a Literal. And as it would be a Madneſs to ſuppoſe all Mankind might in future Ages become ſo ſottiſh, as to renounce this Figurative Interpretation, of *JESUS CHRIST*'s being a Door and a Vine, and fall ſo far into the Literal ſence, as to believe him to be ſubſtantially preſent in them, and pay the utmoſt Adorations to him there; ſet them up in Temples to be adored, and celebrate Feaſts in Honour of them: So we cannot but think it to be very irrational to imagine, that, if the Diſciples, and the whole Church in all Nations, had been once taught, theſe Words, *This is my Body*, were to be taken in a Figurative ſence, it could ever have happned the Viſible Church in all Nations ſhould agree to teach their Children that it ought to be taken in a Literal; and proceed ſo far as to pay their Adorations to what they knew was but a morſel of Bread, expoſe it to be worſhipped, *&c.* which they could

not but know was an Idolatry would bring inevitable Damnation to them and their Posterity, who should be guilty of it. And further, We cannot see how it can enter into the Minds of Rational Men, that this so grand an Errour should either overspread the Church in a moment, or so insensibly creep into it, that she, who was so vigilant in all other Errours of lesser moment, should yet be so blind as not to see this, or so wicked as not to take notice of it.

He should then, if he would have opposed *M. de Meaux*, or the Catholic Church, have undertaken to prove, That the very Words of the Institution *oblige* us to take them in a Literal sence.

He tells us indeed, That if the Relative *This*, in that Proposition, *This is my Body*, referred to the Bread that our Saviour held in his Hands, the natural repugnancy there is betwixt the two things affirmed of one another, Bread and *CHRIST*'s Body, will necessarily require the Figurative Interpretation. But unless he can prove that the Pronoun (*hoc*) *this* must necessarily relate to (*Panis*) *Bread*, and not to (*Corpus*) *Body*, his Argument will avail him nothing; but that all his Logic will never be able to effect. His Argument is this: *What did he say was his Body, but that which he gave to his Disciples? What did he give to his Disciples, but that which he broke? What brake he, but that which he took? And St.* Luke *says expresly, He took Bread.* But what follows from all this, but that *JESUS took Bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY?* But he go's on: *What JESUS took in his Hands, that he blessed: What he blessed, the same he brake and gave to his Disciples: What he gave to his Disciples,*

Pag. 48.

of

of that he ſaid, This is my Body: But JESUS, *ſays the Text, took Bread; of the Bread therefore he ſaid, THIS IS MY BODY.* But what do's all this argue againſt us, unleſs he beg the Queſtion, and ſuppoſe that no real Change was made by thoſe Words? Which to ſhew how true it is, let us propoſe an Example. We will ſuppoſe, and that not incongruouſly, that our Bleſſed Saviour, in changing the Water into Wine, might have made uſe of theſe, either mental or vocal Words; *This is Wine*, or *let this be Wine*: Now here it is manifeſt the Word *This* was not determined, but only ſignified Subſtance, till the Word *Wine* was annexed. This ſuppoſed, if any one would ſee the force of his Argument, let him change the Expreſſion, and inſtead of *Bread* uſe *Water*, and inſtead of *Body* uſe *Wine*, and then reflect whether he can from thence prove that theſe Words, *This is Wine*, muſt neceſſarily mean, *This Water is Wine*: or rather, whether that would not be a Propoſition which implies a Contradiction, as *Gratian* and Cardinal *Bellarmine* prove in the foregoing Places cited by him, of the like Propoſition, *This is my Body.*

Gratian de Conſecrat. d. 2. c. 55.
Bellarm. l. 3. c. 19. SS. primum.

But it will not be amiſs to conſider Cardinal *Bellarmine*'s Argument, to which this Author refers. He tells us there, how theſe Words, "*Take and eat*, "*for this is my Body*, muſt neceſſarily infer either a "real Change of the Bread, as *Catholics*; or elſe a "metaphorical Change, as the *Calviniſts* hold: but "that they will by no means admit of the *Lutherans* ſence. Which Propoſition he endeavours to "prove againſt the *Lutherans*, affirming the Words, "*This is my Body*, to bear neceſſarily one of theſe "three ſences. Firſt, *This which is contained under* "*the ſpecies of Bread, is my Body*; which is the *Ca-*

"*tholic*

"*tholic* ſence, and ſuppoſes a Mutation. The ſe-
"cond is that of the *Sacramentaries*, who admit of
"no Mutation; and their ſence is, *This Bread is the*
"*Figure of my Body.* The third, which is that of
"the *Lutherans*, who admit of no Change, but yet
"allow a Real Preſence, muſt bear this Interpretati-
"on, *This truly Wheaten Bread is truly and properly*
"*my Body.* But this (ſays he) can by no means
"be admitted, whether we ſpeak of the thing it
"ſelf, or of the Propoſition: For it cannot poſſibly
"be, that one thing ſhould not be changed, and yet
"ſhould be another; for it would be that thing, and
"would not be that thing. Moreover, in an Affir-
"mative Propoſition it is neceſſary the *Subjectum*, (or
"thing of which any thing is affirmed) and the *Præ-*
"*dicatum*, (or thing affirm'd of it) ſhould have a
"regard to the ſame thing. Then follow the Words
which he cites: "*It cannot therefore be, that that*
"*Propoſition ſhould be true, in which the* Subjectum,
"or former part, *deſigns Bread; and the* Prædica-
"tum, or latter part, *the Body of CHRIST: For*
"*Bread and the Body of CHRIST are two very*
"*different things.* This indeed may prove that the
Words of the Inſtitution may poſſibly lead to a Figu-
rative Interpretation; but are far from proving that
they oblige us to take them ſo, which was what the
Biſhop of *Condom* affirmed, and which he, if he had
uſed Sincerity, ſhould have oppugned; and not have
ſpent ſo much time to prove what was not the Que-
ſtion.

But, as I ſaid, it is not my Buſineſs here to juſtifie
our Tenets, but to ſee what he has to ſay againſt the
Expoſition as ſuch.

I do

I do not find he pretends here that the Biſhop of *Meaux* has *palliated* or *prevaricated* the Doctrine of the Catholic Church: But I obſerve, he uſes frequently the Word *Corporeally*, and the *Corporeal Preſence*; which the Biſhop has avoided, keeping himſelf to the Terms of the Council of *Trent*, which tells us only, that *JESUS CHRIST* is *truly, really, and ſubſtantially preſent in the Sacrament*; but uſes not the Word *Corporeally*, I ſuppoſe, becauſe it may bear a double ſence, and ſignifie either, firſt, that the Body is really and ſubſtantially preſent, tho' not after a carnal, groſs manner, with all the Qualifications of a Natural Body; and this is the ſence of thoſe Catholics who make uſe of it: Or, ſecondly, it may be taken as ſignifying the Body to be preſent after a corporeal, carnal manner, with all the Conditions and Qualities of a Natural Body; which ſence our Enemies are apt to impute to us, as if it were our Doctrine, tho very unjuſtly.

But had he been Faithful in giving us the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, I doubt not but the Arguments he brings againſt the Biſhop of *Meaux*, would have proved as much againſt it, as it do's againſt ours.

He tells us, *They confeſs this Sacrament to be ſomewhat more than a meer Figure; but they deny, that therefore it muſt be his very Body*; I would gladly know what that is which is not the thing it ſelf, but yet is more than a meer Figure of it. If he mean that it is not the Body Corporeally, according to the Explication of the word as I have given it in the Second Sence, we agree with him: But if he mean, by this *ſomewhat more than a meer Figure*, that the *Body and Blood of* JESUS CHRIST *is verily and indeed* Pag. 52.

taken

taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lords Supper, as their Church Catechiſm has it; I ſee not alſo in what the difference conſiſts betwixt us, neither can I ſee how his Arguments oppugn our Doctrine without confuting theirs.

'Tis true, their Twenty eighth Article tells us, that *The Body of Chriſt is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a Heavenly and Spiritual manner; and that the means whereby the Body of* CHRIST *is receiv'd, and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.* Yet becauſe I am not willing to think their Canons and Church Catechiſm contradict one another; I am willing to think the meaning of the ſaying, that Faith is the means by which they receive it, is, that they cannot receive the benefit of *Chriſts* Preſence without a lively Faith, but ſhould rather Eat and Drink their own Damnation; as is more fully expreſs'd in the next Article: and alſo that the expreſſions of a Heavenly and Spiritual manner, are only to oppoſe that Carnal and Groſs manner which a Natural Body has, as having local extention, &c. which Body, as ſuch, cannot poſſibly be in more places then one, as St. *Auguſtin* affirms, and to which that part of the Article in *Edw.* the Sixths days (to which this has ſucceeded) do's allude. If he think I impoſe upon their Church, I deſire him to let us know by ſome Authentic Teſtimony, what is the meaning of that part of the Article; and to ſhew us how it can ſtand with the Doctrine deliver'd in the Church Chatechiſm, which affirms as I have told you, that *The inward thing ſignified is the Body and Blood of our Lord* JESUS CHRIST *which is* verily *and* indeed *taken and receiv'd by the Faithful*; it do's not ſay, *by Faith*, but *by the Faithful*: As alſo how it agrees with

Sparrow's Canons, pag. 49.

with theſe words of the ſame Article, *The Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of* CHRIST, *and likewiſe the Cup of Bleſſing is a partaking of the Blood of* CHRIST.

If then he admit with King *James*, that they believe JESUS CHRIST to be as really preſent in the Sacrament as *Roman Catholics* do, but only know not the manner: What becomes of all his *Sarcaſms* of *Worſhipping a Deity, whoſe ſubſtance they firſt form'd and then ſpake it into a God*, &c. He knew full well that ſuch Objections were the very Calumnies of the Heathens, who did not only object to Chriſtians their eating of their God, but alſo of eating Mans Fleſh in their Sacrifices, of drinking Childrens Blood, and ſeveral other ſuch like accuſations; all which proceeded from ſome imperfect knowledge they had got of the Chriſtian Sacrifice, notwithſtanding all the care the Primitive Chriſtians took to conceal that Adorable Myſtery from Infidels, and even Catechumens. What becomes of all the Arguments brought from pretended contradictions, and an impoſſibility of being preſent in many places at once? Do's not their real Participation (*if*, as the Biſhop ſays, *there be any Sence in the Words*) fall under the ſame cenſures? And what becomes of all his Objections rais'd from the difference betwixt ſome Schoolmen who endeavour to explicate the manner of his preſence; and the free acknowledgment of others, that we are ignorant of it? Do not they themſelves profeſs the ſame? And if we cannot comprehend how God can be three and one, or the Divinity be Incarnate, muſt we neceſſarily therefore deny the Bleſſed Trinity, or the Incarnation? In a word, what will become of all the Arguments in General brought againſt Tranſubſtantiation,

Cauſab. Ep. ad Card. Per.

Pag. 61.

ſubſtantiation, Adoration, Sacrifice of the Altar, Communion under one Species, &c. ſeeing Learned Proteſtants themſelves confeſs, that if the words of the Inſtitution be taken in a Literal Sence (without which a Real Preſence can never be admitted) they muſt yield up the Cauſe in all thoſe Points to *Roman Catholics*? This *Brerelay* has ſhown in his *Liturgy* of the Maſs Printed *Anno* 1620. *pag.* 225, 339. from ſeveral of their own Authors.

But he tells us, "that many of our Schoolmen acknowledge there is not in the Scripture any formal "proof of Tranſubſtantiation; that there is not any "Texts that without the declaration of the Church "would be able to evince it; that it was not a matter "of Faith till the Council of *Lateran*; and then triumphs as if theſe expreſſions were a perfect yielding up of our Cauſe.

But I would gladly have him to conſider upon what account it is theſe Learned Men uſe thoſe expreſſions, and examine a little their Reaſons, and then I doubt not but if he obſerve the Connection of their Diſcourſe, he will not find ſuch an occaſion of triumphing.

It is an uſual thing with Noveliſts to pretend nothing muſt be admitted as a matter of Faith, but what can be manifeſtly proved from plain Texts of Scripture: This Catholics deny, and tell them, ſuch a propoſition deſtroys all our Faith; becauſe no body can prove, for example, by Scripture the Books of the Goſpels or the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* to be the Word of God or Divine Revelation: and if they cannot prove thoſe Scriptures to be Divine, but by Tradition and the Interpoſition of the Church; and yet tell us Tradition and Church Authority are not ſufficient,

ſufficient, what will become of all the Articles contain'd in thoſe Books? Nay further, Catholics tell them, that if they rely only upon the bare words of Scripture without having recourſe to the Authority of a Church, and the Conſent of Paſtors and Teachers in all Ages and Places, they will never be able to demonſtrate any one Doctrine; that is, they can never prove it ſo clearly as to convince thoſe who rely wholly upon their Reaſon, and will admit of nothing for a proof in ſuch weighty matters, but what is ſo clear, that whoever underſtands the Terms and Propoſitions muſt neceſſarily conſent to the Concluſion drawn from them. The Schoolmen do not only inſtance the Real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation in proof of this; but the Trinity alſo and Incarnation, and in a word, all the Articles of our Creed.

And the very oppoſition which Heretics in the ſeveral Ages of the Church have form'd againſt thoſe Doctrines is a clear proof of this, ſeeing they, upon all occaſions, pretended Scripture for their grounds, and becauſe Catholics could not bring any Text of Scripture againſt them ſo clear but they could elude it by ſome ſeeming Expoſition; therefore Scripture alone could never decide the Controverſies; but the voice of the Church in her Councils was in all Ages eſteem'd neceſſary to ſtop their Mouths, and her Deciſions and Declarations of the Sence of Scripture was that which confounded all their Errors.

Thus it was that *Arius* and his followers were condemned by the Council of *Nice*, not by the ſole words of Scripture, but by the words of Scripture as underſtood and explicated by the conſent of the Catholic Church; and thus it was that *Berengarius* and his followers were condemned by the Council

of *Lateran* and ſeveral others, and that Condemnation confirm'd by that of *Trent*.

He tells us, moreover, *That this Doctrine was no*
Pag. 56: *matter of Faith till the Council of* Lateran, 1200 *years after* CHRIST; *and had not That and the Council of* Trent *interpoſed, it would not have been ſo to this very day.* And cites *Lombard*, *Scotus*, *Gabriel*, and *Bellarmine* for this Aſſertion. Let us examine his Quotations; but firſt we will repreſent the State of the Queſtion, as the beſt Method to underſtand their Meanings.

We muſt therefore take notice, that the word *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt publicly uſed in the Council of *Lateran*, as the word *Conſubſtantial* was in the firſt Council of *Nice*; but that, as the thing intended by the word *Conſubſtantial* was all along of Faith before that Council, ſo was the thing intended by *Tranſubſtantiation* ever believed by the Faithful in all Ages. The thing intended by the word *Tranſubſtantiation* is expreſſed by the Council of *Trent* in theſe words.

Seſſ. 13. Can. 2. *If any one ſhall ſay, That the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remains in the moſt Holy Sacrament of the* Euchariſt, *together with the Body and Blood of our Lord* JESUS CHRIST; *and ſhall deny that wonderful and ſingular Converſion of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Subſtance of Wine into the Blood, the Species of Bread and Wine only remaining, which Converſion the Catholic Church do's moſt aptly call* Tranſubſtantiation: *Let him be* Anathema.

Ibid. Can. 1. Chap. 1. This Council having before expreſſed our Belief of the true, real, and ſubſtantial Preſence of the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST in the moſt Holy Sacrament, brings this *Tranſubſtantiation*, or Converſion

on

on of one Subſtance into another, as the natural Conſequence of it. But becauſe there are many ſorts of Converſions of one Subſtance into another, all which may be called *Subſtantial Converſions*, and by conſequence the word *Tranſubſtantiation* might be properly enough uſed to expreſs that Change; therefore it is manifeſt the Church do's not intend here to fix the Manner of that Converſion; but only to declare the Matter, (*viz.*) That the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST becomes truly, really, and ſubſtantially preſent, the Bread and Wine ceaſing to be there truly, really, and ſubſtantially preſent, tho the Appearances thereof remain. This Matter is that which is of Faith, and was always ſo before the Council of *Lateran*: but as for the Manner how this Converſion is made, it is even at preſent a diſputable Queſtion in the Schools. It being then manifeſt, that our Diſpute with *Proteſtants* is not about the Manner how JESUS CHRIST is preſent, but only about the thing it ſelf, whether the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST be truly, really, and ſubſtantially preſent after the Words of Conſecration, under the *ſpecies* or appearance of Bread and Wine, the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being not ſo preſent; let us examine whether the Authorities he brings, as to both his Aſſertions, have any force againſt our Tenets.

He tells us firſt, That *Lombard*, *Scotus*, and many others confeſs, *that there is not in Scripture any formal Proof of Tranſubſtantiation:* and cites in the Margin *Lombard.* 4. *Sent. diſt.* 10. But there is no ſuch thing in him, as I ſhall more fully ſhew in declaring his Doctrine. He brings in *Scotus* alſo, 4. *Diſt.* 2. *Qu.* 11. whereas there are only two Queſtions in that Diſtinction.

His

Bellar. de Euch. l. 3. c. 23. ff. Secundo dicit.

His next Quotation is *Bellarmine*, who, he ſays, confeſſes, and cites many others of the ſame Opinion, *That there is not any* (formal Proof from Scripture) *that without the Declaration of the Church would be able to evince it.* 'Tis true, *Bellarmine* here acknowledges that *Scotus* ſaid *there was not any Place in Scripture ſo expreſs, that it would* evidently compel *any one to admit of* Tranſubſtantiation *without the Churches Declaration*; which, he confeſſes, *is not altogether improbable. For*, ſays he, *altho the Scripture, which we have mentioned above, do's appear to us ſo clear, that it may compel a Man who is not perverſe to believe it; yet whether it be ſo or no, we may juſtly doubt, ſince Learned and Acute Men, ſuch as in the firſt place* Scotus *was, have thought the contrary.* And this is all he ſays.

'Tis true alſo, that *Scotus*, in 4. *Diſt.* 11. *Qu.* 3. *n.* 5. brings this Objection, *That nothing is to be held as of the Subſtance of Faith, but what is expreſly to be had out of Scripture, or is expreſly declared by the Church, or evidently follows from what is plainly contained in Scripture, or plainly determined by the Church: But that it neither appears manifeſtly from Scripture, nor from the Churches Declaration, nor is it evidently inferred from either, that the Subſtance of Bread do's not remain in the Euchariſt:* And anſwers it *n.* 15. thus; *That the Church has declared it in the Council of* Lateran, c. Firmiter Credimus: In which Chapter, he tells us, *the Truth of ſome things which are to be believed, are more explicitly declared than they were in the Apoſtles Creed, or in that of* Nice, *or that of St.* Athanaſius. So that from hence ſome have concluded, that *Scotus* probably held this Aſſertion, *That the Scripture did not evince it*; as alſo the

the other, *That the Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation *was not ſo explicitly believed before that Council of* Lateran, *as it was ſince.* But this is no more than what he, or any one might ſay of the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son, before the Council of *Nice.*

It is alſo to be taken notice, that this Diſtinction of *P. Lombard* was wholly written upon the Manner of *CHRIST*'s Exiſtence in the Sacrament, and other Scholaſtic Diſputes of that nature, and not upon the thing it ſelf as of Faith; and therefore no wonder if *Scotus*, writing upon that Diſtinction, ſhould grant how that manner of Converſion, which he thought was a Conſequence of the Council of *Laterans* Definition, was not ſo explicitly known before that Council as ſince, or not clearly found in Scripture. But if you look upon him, *Diſt.* 10. *qu.* 1. *n.* 2, 3. where he is to treat of the Real Preſence of *CHRIST*'s Body and Blood under the *ſpecies* of Bread and Wine, he tells us, that it is *a Truth which was expreſly delivered from the beginning, even from the very time of the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt.* His Words are, *Iſta enim veritas a principio fuit expreſsè tradita, ex quo Euchariſtia fuit inſtituta.* And he adds, That *the Foundation of that Authority are the Words of the Inſtitution, This is my Body, and this is my Blood*; which he ſays cannot be taken Figuratively, if we obſerve the Rule of St. *Auguſtin*, "*That* Aug. 83. Queſt. qu. 69.
"*the Circumſtances of Scripture do clear the Senſe of*
"*it:* For CHRIST having added to theſe Words, *This*
"*is my Body*, this Circumſtance, *which ſhall be bro-*
"*ken for you*; and to theſe Words, *This is my Blood*,
"this Circumſtance, *which ſhall be ſhed for you*, it
"is manifeſt they ought to be taken in a Literal
"ſence.

Then

Then he tells us, That Cardinal *Cajetan* acknowledges, That *had not the Church declared her ſelf for the proper ſenſe of the Words, the other might with as good warrant have been received*; and quotes him *in 3. D. Thomæ, qu. 75. art. 1.* But he ſays no ſuch thing, nay rather the contrary, as will appear to any one who reads that Article, in which he tells us, That *we learn from the Truth of the Words of our Lord taken in their proper ſence, that the Body of* CHRIST *is truly in the Euchariſt*; *which is the firſt thing*, ſays he, *which we learn concerning this Sacrament from the Goſpel. But the ſecond*, continues he, *which the Goſpel has not explicated, we have expreſly received from the Church, that is, the Converſion of Bread into the Body of* CHRIST; *which*, he ſays, *we have not only received from the ancient Doctors of the Church, but from the Council of* Lateran *under Pope* Innocent *the Third*, De Summa Trinit. & Fide Cath. Firmiter credimus; *where both Points are expreſſed*, viz. *That the Body and Blood of* CHRIST *are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the* ſpecies *of Bread and Wine* (*which regards the firſt*). *And it follows, The Bread being tranſubſtantiated into his Body, and the Wine into his Blood, by Divine Power.*

After this, he ſpeaks of the Reality of CHRIST's Body in the *Euchariſt*, and of the Manner how it becomes there, *viz.* by Converſion; and of the firſt he ſays, *Sciendum eſt, omnes circa primam novitatem continentiæ, & re & voce conſenſiſſe, dum omnes communiter fatemur corpus Chriſti prius non contentum ſub hac hoſtia modo veraciter contineri: quamvis circa modum quo continetur variæ ſint opiniones.* (*i.e.*) "We muſt know, that all Perſons are at

"perfect

"perfect agreement both as to the manner of Ex-
"preſſion, and as to the thing it ſelf, when we ſpeak
"of the firſt new Change which is there made of the
"thing contained, ſeeing we all commonly confeſs,
"that the Body of CHRIST, which was not at firſt
"contained under this Hoſt, is now truly there con-
"tained: tho there be various Opinions concerning
"the manner how he is there contained.

Then ſumming up ſeveral of thoſe Opinions, as, Whether it be by ſuch a Change as is made by Nutrition; or, Whether the Bread be Annihilated; or, Whether it be by a true Converſion; he undertakes to prove, that it is by a *Converſion which do's produce and effect the Preſence of* CHRIST *in the Hoſt*, and freely confeſſes, that this Converſion is not explicitly mentioned in the Goſpel, but only deduced from the words *This is my Body*, by the Doctors of the Church.

After which, returning to his firſt Point, in which he had concluded, that the Body of CHRIST was truly in the Sacrament, he tells us, *In hoc omnes fideles conveniunt: ſed modus quo eſt in diſputationem vertitur: All the Faithful agree in this; but as to the manner how he is there, that is a diſputable Queſtion.*

This is, in ſhort, the Intent of that Article, which is far from what this Author has impoſed upon him.

Next he tells us, *That the generality of our Communion confeſs, that if the Words of Conſecration refer to the Bread which is changed by them, they muſt be taken in their* (Figurative) *ſence.* But this has been ſufficiently cleared already. Pag. 74, 75.

Laſtly, He tells us, That *this Doctrine was no matter of Faith till the Council of* Lateran, 1200

years after CHRIST; *and that had not That and the Council of* Trent *ſince interpoſed, it would not have been ſo to this very day.* What Doctrine do's he here mean? Not that of the Schools, concerning the manner of CHRIST's Exiſtence in the Sacrament; for a little after he tells us, That *Anathema's* have been pronounced againſt them, and they eſteemed Heretics and Schiſmatics for oppoſing it: But the Church never yet proceeded ſo far as to declare the Manner, or cenſure any Opinions concerning it.

By this Doctrine then, which he tells us was not of Faith till the Council of *Lateran*, he muſt underſtand the Doctrine of the Church, and ſay, That the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST was not till then believed to be truly, really, and ſubſtantially preſent under the *ſpecies* or appearances of Bread, the Subſtance of Bread being not ſo preſent after Conſecration. But how do's he prove this? He firſt brings *Scotus* cited by *Bellarmine*; but we have already examined his Conceſſions, which make but little for our Adverſary. pag. 84

Then he quotes *Gabriel* cited by *Suarez*, *T.* 3. *Diſp.* 50. *ſect.* 1. But *Suarez* there undertaking to prove two Aſſertions; the firſt, *That the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is made by a true Converſion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of* CHRIST, *which*, he tells us, *is of Faith*; and the ſecond, *That this Sacrament is made by a true Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread into the Body, and of the Wine into the Blood of* CHRIST: he tells us, "That the word "*Tranſubſtantiation*, taken in its proper and ſtrict "ſence, ſignifies *tranſitum ſeu converſionem totius* "*ſubſtantiæ in totam ſubſtantiam*; a Tranſition or "Converſion of a whole Subſtance into a whole Sub-

"ſtance.

"ſtance. After which, he concludes thus: From "this Doctrine of Faith we may gather, firſt, That "the Scholaſtics, as *Scotus* and *Gabriel*, are to be cor- "rected— and, ſecondly, That the thing it ſelf was "ancient, and perpetually believed in the Church, "tho perhaps in former times it was not ſo fully ex- "plicated as now it is.

Non fuerit tam apertè explicata, ſicut modo eſt,

In the laſt place he quotes *Lombard*, *L.* 4. *Diſt.* 11. *Lit. A.* But it is manifeſt that *Lombard* ſpeaks there only of a Scholaſtic Tenet: Which to the end you may ſee, as alſo what was eſteemed of Faith in his time, before the Council of *Lateran*, I will give you a ſhort account of his whole Doctrine, as to this Point.

He begins his eighth Diſtinction telling us, "That "the Bleſſed Sacrament was inſtituted *when* JESUS "CHRIST, *after the Typical Lamb, gave to his Diſci- "ples his Body and Blood in the Laſt Supper.* Then ſpeaking of the Form, *This is my Body*, &c. he tells us, "*Cum hæc verba proferuntur, converſio fit panis "& vini in ſubſtantiam corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti: "That when theſe words are pronounced, there is made "a Converſion of Bread and Wine into the Subſtance "of the Body and Blood of* CHRIST.

Lomb. in 4. diſt. 8. Lit. B.

Lit. C.

Then ſpeaking of a Sacrament as being the Sign of a Sacred thing, he tells us what is the Sign, and what is the Thing in this Sacrament. "The Form "(*i. e.* Appearance) ſays he, of Bread and Wine in the "Sacrament, is the Sign of the Sacred thing— "So that the *ſpecies* bear the Name of the Things "which they were before, that is, of Bread and "Wine: But the thing ſignified is twofold; the "one contained under thoſe *ſpecies*, and ſignified by "them; the other ſignified, but not contained. The

Lit. D.

" thing contained and ſignified is the Fleſh of *Chriſt* " which he took from the Bleſſed Virgin, and the " Blood which he ſhed for us. But the thing which " is ſignified and not contain'd, is the Unity of the " Church in thoſe who are Predeſtinated, Called, " Juſtified and Glorified. So that there are, ſays he, " three things to be diſtinguiſh'd, one which is only " a Sacrament, and not the thing, (*viz.*) the viſi- " ble ſpecies of Bread and Wine; another which is " the Sacrament and the thing, (*viz.*) the proper " Fleſh and Blood of *Chriſt*; and a third, which is " the thing and not the Sacrament, (*viz.*) his My- " ſtical Body that is his Church; but the viſible ſpe- " cies are the Sacrament or Sign of both theſe " things.

" Then in his Ninth Diſtinction ſpeaking of a " two fold Manducation, the one Sacramental, in " which the good and bad do Eat the Body of *Chriſt*; " and the other only Spiritual, in which only the " good are made partakers of it; which is by Faith: " he proceeds to tell us of the Errours of ſome, who " held that the bad did not receive the Body of " *Chriſt*: and affirms, that it muſt be undoubtedly " held, that it is received by the good not only Sa- " cramentally but Spiritually, whereas the bad re- " ceive it only Sacramentally; that is, under the vi- " ſible ſpecies of Bread and Wine they receive that " Fleſh of *Chriſt* which he took from the Bleſſed Vir- " gin, and the Blood which he ſhed for us; but not " the Myſtical Body, that is the benefits of his pre- " ſence; All which he there proves from St. *Gregory* and St. *Auguſtin*, and explicates ſome ambiguous terms which might give occaſion of errour.

Diſt. 10. His next Diſtinction cited by this Author which treats

treats *De hæreſi aliorum*, &c. *Of the Hereſie of others, who ſay, that the Body of* Chriſt *is not upon the Altar but in Sign*, tells us, *That there are others who tranſcend the madneſs of the former* (Heretics) *who meaſuring the Power of God according to the manner of natural things, do more audaciouſly and dangerouſly contradict the truth, affirming that the Body and Blood of* Chriſt *are not on our Altars, and that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine are not converted into the ſubſtance of his Fleſh and Blood—— and take occaſion of erring from the words of Truth, whence began the firſt Hereſie* (againſt this Truth) *amongſt* Chriſt's *Diſciples.* Then ſhewing what pretenſions they make for their Errour both from Scripture and Fathers, and having ſolved them, he ſays, *Satis reſponſum eſt Hæreticis & objectionibus eorum: We have ſufficiently anſwered Heretics and their Objections who deny the true Body of* Chriſt *to be on our Altars, and the Bread to be changed into his Body and the Wine into his Blood by a Myſtical Conſecration.* Then ſetting down his proofs out of the Fathers to confirm our Doctrine, he concludes this Diſtinction with theſe words; *Ex his aliisque pluribus conſtat*, &c. "From theſe and many others it is manifeſt, that "the true Body and Blood of *Chriſt* is on our Altars, "yea that whole *Chriſt* is there under both ſpe- "cies; and that the Subſtance of Bread is converted "into his Body and the ſubſtance of Wine into his "Blood.

Having thus confirm'd the ſubſtance of our Faith as to the thing, he proceeds in his next Diſtinction cited alſo by this Author to treat of the manner how this Converſion is made, whether it be Formal or Subſtantial, or of ſome other kind; and this being a Dist. 11. Lib. 4.

pure

pure Scholaſtic Nicety, he tell us, he dare not undertake to define it, but declares, that if we ask him about the manner he will give us this ſhort anſwer, *Myſterium fidei credi ſalubriter poteſt, inveſtigari ſalubriter non poteſt, A Myſtery of Faith may be ſafely believ'd, but not ſafely ſearched into.*

Lit. C.

This is the Doctrine of *Lombardus* who lived before the Council of *Lateran*, and this is the Doctrine we now hold without the leaſt alteration; and this Doctrine was always held ever ſince the Inſtitution, tho' it was thought convenient by the Primitive Fathers to conceal it from the Enemies of Chriſtianity, and from thoſe who were not Initiated; ſo that it may be ſaid, that it is now more publicly taught than it was then, but was always equally believ'd by the Faithful.

Theſe things being thus cleared, and the charge he has made againſt us being found to be thus falſe, the conſequences he has drawn from thence, will fall upon himſelf, and we muſt needs tell him, that we cannot but admire the Power of Truth, and hope that God has permitted him thus to miſrepreſent our Tenets, to diſguiſe the Truth, and to cite Authors contrary to their Intentions, that the Eyes of of all thoſe of his Communion may be opened, and that they may ſee what blind guides they follow, who either take up things upon truſt, or wilfully prevaricate the Text, that they may keep them in Ignorance.

Pag. 61.

Moreover this Author affirms, the Church never taught nor practiſed the Adoration of the Sacrament for above 1000 years; that the Elevation of it was not heard of till the Seventh Century, and then uſed not to expoſe it to the People to be adored, but

to

to repreſent the lifting up of CHRIST upon the Croſs; that all the Circumſtances of this Worſhip are but Inventions of yeſterday; that the Primitive Chriſtians did ſeveral Actions which ſeem inconſiſtent with Adoration, &c. And we muſt take all theſe Aſſertions upon his bare word for Truths. I ſhall not go about to ſwell this Anſwer, by proving an Adoration of the Bleſſed Sacrament within the firſt 400 years, and the Expreſſions of the firſt Ages which argue an Elevation, nor the other Proofs we have for a Real Preſence, nor the Conſent of the moſt Learned Proteſtants; this has been too frequently done, to repeat it here: The Reader who is deſirous of ſearching into the Truth, may ſee, if he underſtand *French*, what *M. Arnold* has writ in Three Volumes, of the Perpetuity of Faith; or elſe what *Brierlay* has written concerning the Sacrifice of *Maſs*; what *Coccius* in his *Theſaurus*, and what many others have publiſhed upon thoſe Accounts; in which they will find, that our Doctrine is conformable to Scripture, that it has been continued down to our time by an uninterrupted Succeſſion, and that our Practices have been always conformable to our Doctrine; which is ſufficient to evince the Truth of it, and ſhew the unjuſt Pretences of a Reformation.

ART.

ART. XVI.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.

Pag. 62. IN his Twentieth Article, *Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs*, which he tells us *is juſtly eſteemed one of the greateſt and moſt dangerous Errours that offends them*; he yet acknowledges, That *ſetting aſide the Foundation of the CORPOREAL PRESENCE, on which the Biſhop builds, and his Conſequence, That this Service is a TRUE AND REAL PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE, which*, he ſays, *they are perſuaded his manner of Expounding it will never bear; there is little in it beſides, but what they could readily aſſent to.* But if he cannot allow of the *Corporeal Preſence*, will he, with the Church of *England* in her Catechiſm, allow a *Real Preſence*? If he do, I would gladly know whether that Foundation be not ſolid enough to build thoſe Doctrines on, which *M. de Meaux* has founded upon that Reality. If he will not allow of a Real Preſence, how is he of the Church of *England*?

Again, I would gladly know of him what the Church of *England* holds concerning her Prieſts, whether they be truly Prieſts or no, whether ſhe acknowledge a Sacrifice and an Altar, truly and properly ſpeaking, tho' not poſſibly in ſuch a rigorous ſence as may be put upon the Words? If ſhe do not, what means her Ordination, and the Title of Prieſthood which her Miniſters challenge with ſo much earneſtneſs? And if ſhe do, why will he quarrel
Seſſ. 22. with the Council of *Trent* for calling it a *True and Proper Sacrifice*, &c. a *True and Proper Prieſthood*? eſpecially

eſpecially ſince the ſame Council tells us, that this Sacrifice is inſtituted only *to repreſent that which was once accompliſhed upon the Croſs; to perpetuate the Memory of it to the end of the World; and ſo apply to us the ſaving virtue of it, for the remiſſion of thoſe Sins which we commit every day.* Seſſ. 22. c. 1.

In a word, The Biſhop of *Meaux* has expreſſed himſelf ſo clearly and conſequently to the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent* and of the Catholic Church, that I cannot but admire any one who affirms, as this Author do's, that the Doctrine the Biſhop of *Meaux* has expreſs'd, *is truly the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, and ſuch as the Church of* England *has never refus'd: and except it be their doubt of the Corporeal Preſence,* Monſ. de Meaux *had certainly reaſon to expect there was nothing in it which they could juſtly except againſt*; I cannot, I ſay, but admire he ſhould upon no better grounds than a pure Cavil about the Name and Nature of a Sacrifice, when taken in the ſtricteſt Senſe, and the word *Corporeal* inſtead of *Real*, affirm this to be *one of the moſt dangerous Errours that offend them.* But the Breach muſt be kept open, and widened too if poſſible. And becauſe *the offering of* Chriſt *once made, is that proper Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World; and becauſe there is no other Satisfaction for Sin but that alone,* as their Article expreſſes it and we allow, therefore this Author muſt from thence conclude, that the Repreſentation, Commemoration and Application of that firſt Offering by thoſe who are Members of that Prieſthood, according to the *Order of Melchiſedec*, which the Apoſtle tells us was to be *perpetual*, muſt not be called a *True, Proper and Propitiatory* Pag. 63. Pag. 62. [Article 31. Heb. 6.

pitiatory Sacrifice, tho' it be only Commemorative and Applicatory.

ART. XVII.

Of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

Art. 21. p. 67. BUT the next Article ſhews us more manifeſtly, that all this Diſpute is purely *de Nomine*. In which it manifeſtly appears that he miſtakes the Pag. 32. Sence of the word *Offer*, as uſed by the Catholic Church in this place; for the Biſhop of *Meaux* tells us, the Catholic Church forms her Language and her Doctrine not from the ſole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* but from the whole body of the Holy Scripture, and therefore, tho' in that ſtrict ſence, in which the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* uſes the word *Offer*, JESUS CHRIST cannot be ſaid to be now offered, neither in the Euchariſt, nor any where elſe; yet becauſe in other places of Scripture the word is uſed in a larger ſignification, where it is often ſaid, we offer to God what we preſent before him; therefore ſhe do's not doubt to ſay, that ſhe offers up our Bleſſed *JESUS* to his Father in the Euchariſt, in which he vouchſafes to render himſelf preſent before him.

But this muſt not ſuffice; for then that which he calls the *principal and moſt dangerous Errour*, would appear to be none at all; and therefore becauſe the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſpeaks of one *Offering which has fully ſatisfied for our Sins*, of one Offering which *was no more to be offered*; that is, of an Offering in a ſtrict Sence, in which there muſt be a Real Suffering and Death of the Victim; therefore this Epiſtle muſt be againſt the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, tho'

tho' ſhe ſpeak only of an Unbloody Sacrifice, of a Commemorative Sacrifice, which without the Sacrifice of the Croſs would be no Sacrifice, which takes its Virtue, Efficacy and very Name from it, becauſe it refers to it, and applies the Virtue of it to our Souls. Let any one judge if this be not next door to a wilful miſunderſtanding of our Tenets, eſpecially when he had before confeſſed that *the preſenting to God Almighty the Sacrifice of our Bleſſed Lord, is a moſt effectual manner of applying his Merits to us, and that if this were all the Church of* Rome *meant by her Propitiatory Sacrifice, there is not certainly any Proteſtant that would oppoſe her in it.* This is what ſhe means by it, (that is) an application of the Merits of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, which was to be but once offered, and from whence it takes all its value. But this he will not have to be our Doctrine; and I ſee no reaſon for it, but becauſe if he admit it to be ſo, one of the greateſt grounds of their pretended Reformation muſt needs vaniſh. Pag. 63.

ART. XVIII.

Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.

HIs Reflections upon this Doctrine run altogether upon the ſame ſtrain; and therefore what I have ſaid will ſuffice in anſwer to that Article. If he admit a Real Preſence with the Church of *England*, Reaſon muſt neceſſarily aſſure us, that where *Chriſt* is really, he ought to be Ador'd; and where he really preſents himſelf to his Father to render him Propitious to us, he may be ſaid to offer up himſelf a Propitiatory Sacrifice. Art. 22. p. 69.

And thoſe who will admit the Reality, or not condemn the belief of it in others, ought not to condemn the neceſſary Conſequences of it in us, into which we have penetrated better than they.

ART. XIX.

Communion under both Species.

Art. 23. p. 72. COmmunion under one kind being alſo a Conſequence of the Doctrine of the Real Preſence. Thoſe who admit the Real Preſence, or condemn it not, ought not to condemn the Conſequence of it. He refers us to the Anſwer to *M. de Meaux*'s Book of Communion; and I refer him to *M. de Meaux*'s Book, which ſo fully explicates and proves this Doctrine, that all the effects againſt it are but vain.

See Art. 30. But if the Church of *England* allow the Communion to be given under one Species in caſe of neceſſity, how will it ſtand that ſhe eſteems it to be the expreſs Command of JESUS CHRIST which is certainly indiſpenſable?

Sparrows Canons p. 15. *Edw.* the Sixth in his Proclamation before the Order of Communion, ordains, "That the Sacrament "of the Body and Blood of our Saviour JESUS "CHRIST ſhould from thenceforth be *commonly* "deliver'd and adminiſtred unto all Perſons within "our Realm of *England* and *Ireland*, and other our "Dominions under both kinds, that is to ſay, of "Bread and Wine, *except neceſſity otherwiſe require.*

And after the Order of Communion, there is this Annotation,

"Note

"Note that the Bread that ſhall be Conſecrated "ſhall be ſuch as heretofore hath been ac- "cuſtomed. And every of the ſaid Conſecra- "ted Breads, ſhall be broken into two pieces at "leaſt or more, by the diſcretion of the Mini- "ſter, and ſo diſtributed. And Men muſt "not think leſs to be received in part, than in "the whole, but in each of them the *whole Bo-* "*dy of* JESUS CHRIST.

In the Proclamation it is ordain'd, that it ſhall be *commonly deliver'd under both kinds except neceſſity otherwiſe require*, which ſhews manifeſtly that the Church of *England* thought then that one kind was ſufficient in caſe of neceſſity, and that a whole Sacrament was contained under one kind; for half a Sacrament is no Sacrament. And, if a neceſſary occaſion be ſufficient to diſpenſe with the Adminiſtration of it in both kinds, who ought to be Judge but the Paſtors and Teachers in every Age, or the Church Repreſentative? which ſhews that this is a part of Diſcipline and not of Faith, ſince both ſides confeſs that in caſe of neceſſity it may be given in one kind, and that by receiving each Particle one receives the whole Body of JESUS CHRIST, as appears by the Annotation, ſo that the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Argument againſt the *Calviniſts* of *France* has its full force againſt the Church of *England*.

ART.

ART. XX.

Of the written and unwritten Word.

Art. 24. p. 75. IN the next Article we are agreed in the main, "We both acknowledge the unwritten Word to "have been the first Rule of Christians, and that it "was so far from losing any thing of its Authority "by addition of the Written Word, that it was in- "deed the more firmly established. We receive with "equal veneration the Written and the Unwritten "Word when we are assured they come from the "Apostles. And as we do not admit of every thing "which is called Tradition, so what is made ap- "pear to have been received in all Churches, and in "all Ages we are ready to embrace as coming from "the Apostles. Our difference consists only in this, who shall be judge when this Tradition is Universal: We rely upon the Judgment of the present Church in every Age either assembled in the most general Council that Age can afford, or else declaring her Doctrine by her constant practice, and the uniform Voice of her Pastors and People; and are assured it is not sufficient for any Private Persons or Church to say *we suppose*, or *we are perswaded* they are contrary to the *Written Word*, or *we find it not there*, to make the Churches Sentence void, or justifie a dissent.

ART. XXI.

Of the Authority of the Church.

IN his next Article, of the Authority of the Church he grants many things which the Biſhop of *Meaux* had aſſerted, from which we might expect great Fruit, but he preſently nips all our hopes in the very bud. Art. 25. p. 76.

He grants the Catholic Church to be the *Guardian of the Holy Scriptures*, and of *Tradition*, and that it is from her Authority they reeeive both. That they never deny the Church to have *an Authority not only in matters of Order and Diſcipline, but even of Faith too.* That they neither fear the entire *defection* of the Catholic Church, nor that ſhe ſhould fall into ſuch an *entire Infidelity* as ſhould *argue her not to be a Church.* And in his next Article he allows the Church *a juſt Authority in matters of Faith*, and declares as a Doctrine of his Church, that they *allow ſuch a deference* to a Churches Deciſions, as to *make them their directions, what Doctrine they may, or may not publicly maintain and teach in her Communion*; that they *ſhew whatever ſubmiſſion they can to her Authority, without violating that of God declared to us in the Holy Scripture:* And laſtly, that *whatſoever deference they allow to a National Church or Council, the ſame they think, in a much greater degree, due to a General. In which none ſhall be more ready to aſſiſt, nor to which none ſhall be more ready to ſubmit.* Theſe are fair offers to eſtabliſh a Church-Authority; and did he not manifeſtly deſtroy all he has here ſaid by ſome other exceptions we might have Pag. 76, 77. Pag. 78. Pag. 80.

have hoped ſome good effects of ſuch a Submiſſion.

Pag. 79. He tells us, and that truly, that any *particular Church may either by errour loſe, or by other means prevaricate the Faith even in neceſſary points of it.*

Pag. 78. And yet notwithſtanding he do's not only ſet up a particular Church to *examine the Churches Deciſions, which* he tells us after all *may err*; but even every individual Perſon; who according to his Doctrine, may not only examine the Deciſions of the *whole Church*, but glory in oppoſing them, if he be but *evidently convinced* that his belief is *founded upon the undoubted Authority of Gods Holy Word.* His

Pag. 79. words are theſe, *Tho' we ſuppoſe the Scriptures are ſo clearly written, that it can hardly happen that in neceſſary Articles of Faith any one Man ſhould be found oppoſite to the whole Church in his Opinion:* He had told us a little before, that *any particular Church* (ſuch as he eſteem'd the Church of *Rome* to be) *might either by Errour loſe, or by any other means prevaricate the Faith, even in neceſſary points of it:* and yet what he there *wiſhes they had not too great cauſe to fear the Church of* Rome *has in effect done,* he here tells us can hardly happen to one particular Man. But what follows is more intolerable, and ſince he gives us it as a Doctrine of the Church of *England,* I deſire him to tell us in what Canon, Article or Conſtitution it is contain'd. *But* (ſays he) *if ſuch an one were evidently convinc'd that his belief was founded upon the undoubted Authority of Gods Holy Word, ſo far would it be from any Errour to ſupport it* [againſt the whole Church] *that it is at this day the greateſt Glory of St.* Athanaſius *that he ſtood up alone againſt the whole World in defence of* Chriſts *Divinity, when the Pope, the Councils, the whole*

whole Church fell away. Behold here a Doctrine which if admitted, will not only maintain all the Diſſenters that are, but that ever can be from a Church; a Doctrine which will eſtabliſh as many Religions as there are Perſons in the World; every one of which may, if he be but *evidently convinced* (that is, if he have but impudence enough to think he is ſo) that his belief is founded upon the *undoubted Authority of Gods Word*, not only oppoſe the *whole Church* but *glory* in it. And a Doctrine backed by as falſe an Authority, as the Aſſertion it ſelf is falſe and ſcandalous; for never any one yet before this Man ſaid that the Pope, the Councils, and the whole Church fell in St. *Athanaſius* his time; on the contrary it is manifeſt to all thoſe who have read any thing of Hiſtory; that the Pope and all the Weſtern Churches, and the approved General Councils of thoſe times, all ſtood up for St. *Athanaſius*; and if he ſaid he was againſt all, and all againſt him, it was only to expreſs the great number of Eaſtern Biſhops that oppos'd his Doctrine: But any thing muſt paſs now, to deceive the vulgar, tho' Men of Sence ſee the contrary.

Another Argument he brings to delude the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, is to make her paſs only for a particular Church. But how often have they been told that Catholics do not take the Church of *Rome* as it is the *Suburbican Dioceſs* to be the Catholic Church, but all the Chriſtian Churches in Communion with the Biſhop of *Rome*. And that this is the true Church appears by the marks of it deliver'd in the *Nicene Creed*, no other Church being able to pretend to that Unity, Sanctity, Univerſality and Antiquity, which ſhe is manifeſtly inveſted

with. The true Church must be *one*, and by consequence *free from Schism*, which destroys that notion which some of late have held, that the true Church is that Catholic Church, which is composed of all Christians, the *Roman*, the *Grecians*, the *Armenians*, *Protestants*, &c. all which they acknowledge to be Members of the True Church; tho' they may be rotten ones, and this notion our Author seems to have of it when he tells us, that the *Roman* Church has in all ages made up *but a part of the Church, and that not always the greatest neither.* The true Church must be also *Holy*, and must by consequence be *free from Heresie*, and teach no *Erroneous Doctrine*; which how it stands with that Idea which this Author insinuates, that the Church of *Rome* has erred even in necessary points of Faith, and is yet a Member of the True Church, is worthy a mature Consideration. This indeed made the first Reformers who accused the *Roman* Catholic Church of *Idolatry* and *Superstition* say, that the Church of JESUS CHRIST was hidden, fled into the Wilderness, and invisible for 1000 or 1200 years, that the Pope was Antichrist, and the Church of *Rome* Antichristian: But the Men of our Age being sufficiently convinced that the Church of *Christ* was to have Kings and Queens for Nursing Fathers and Nursing Mothers, that she was to have Pastors and Teachers in all Ages, that the Administration of the Sacraments, and the Preaching of the true word of God were the *Essential Proprieties of the Church*, &c. and that all these marks do necessarily denote a Visible Church; and finding moreover they could never prove any Christian Kings before *Luther* Converted to Protestancy, or any visible Pastors or Teachers.

Pag. 77.

See the Protestant Authors cited by *Brereley* in his Protestant Apology, Tract. 2. Cap. 1. Sect. 4.

Whitakers contra Duræum, l. 3. p. 260.

Teachers of their Doctrine, or any Aſſembly that Adminiſtred the Sacraments as they do, or Preached the word of God in their Sence; and finding they could not deny the Converſion of many Kings and Nations to the Religion eſtabliſhed in the Church of *Rome*; found themſelves obliged alſo to admit her as a part of the True Church tho' a corrupted one; and would rather deſtroy the *Sanctity* of *Chriſts* Church and her *Unity*, than acknowledge themſelves to be juſtly cut off from being Members of her.

The third Mark is *Catholic*, which is univerſal as to Place, Time, and Doctrine; that Church cannot be the true Church the *ſound whereof is not gone through the whole Earth*, and is not it ſelf ſpread over and viſible in all Nations; that cannot be the true Church which has not continued in all Ages Viſible, Holy and Uniform; neither laſtly, can that be the true Church which either adds or diminiſhes from the Doctrines revealed by God to the Prophets and Apoſtles; ſo that thoſe are as guilty of the Breach of Faith, who refuſe to believe what has been taught, as thoſe who impoſe new Doctrines.

The laſt mark of the Church is, that ſhe muſt be *Apoſtolic*, that is, grounded upon the Doctrines and Faith of the Apoſtles, and deriving a continual Succeſſion from them. All which marks are ſo far from being applicable to the Church of *England*, or to the Univerſal Church according to the notion given of it by theſe late Writers, that a Man of the ſmalleſt judgment, if Impartial, cannot but ſee the fallacy thereof.

ART. XXII.

Authority of the Holy See, and of Epiſcopacy.

AS for his two other Articles, The Opinion of the Church of *England* as to the Authority of the Church, and that of the See Apoſtolic, and Epiſcopacy I have nothing to ſay to him, but to deſire him to
Pag. 81. remember his promiſes, and to enquire what *is the Authority the Antient Councils of the Primitive Church have acknowledged, and the Holy Fathers have always taught the Faithful to give to the Succeſſour to St.* Peter; and whether the firſt Four General Councils might not be termed neither General nor Free with as much Reaſon as the Council of *Trent*, or thoſe others acknowledged by all the Weſtern World, and moſt of the Eaſtern Churches before the new pretended Reformation.

The Concluſion.

I Come now to his Cloſe, in which he ſums up all the Poiſon of his Book; lays what he pleaſes to our charge; and draws what Conſequences he will, to inflame his Reader.

Pag. 82. He tells us of *Bitter and Unchriſtian Hatred we have conceiv'd againſt them*; and deſires to know what warrant we have for it. I deſire all unprejudic'd Perſons to conſider, whether we have not more reaſon to complain than he.

Here was a Church eſtabliſhed in *England*; Truths delivered to her with Chriſtianity it ſelf were here Practis'd and Preach'd; Religious Houſes were

were here endow'd with ample Revenues, &c. when behold a Pretended Reformation comes, deſtroys this Church; diſſolves all the Conſtitutions of it; changes the eſtabliſhed Doctrines; and alters many of its antienteſt Practices; pulls down Religious Houſes and Churches; alienates the Revenues; turns the Religious Inhabitants into the wide World; makes Laws againſt all thoſe who ſhould defend that Doctrine; Impriſonment, loſs of Goods and Fortunes, nay even of Life it ſelf, are the Puniſhments ordained for them who are found guilty of Practiſing or Preaching that Religion. And what leſs could ſuch a Church do than Excommunicate they, who thus Renounc'd her Doctrines, Contemned her Authority, and perſecuted her Children. But this Excommunication muſt be called Severity and unchriſtian hatred. And if we declare that all thoſe who forſake the Unity of the Church are guilty of Schiſm; and they who will not acquieſs to thoſe Points of Faith which God has Revealed, and the Church, which is the *Pillar and Ground of Truth* has declar'd to have been ſo Reveal'd, are guilty of Hereſie; and that Hereſie and Schiſm will bring inevitable damnation to all thoſe who die without repenting of them; we muſt be eſteem'd uncharitable. I muſt therefore Retort his Popular Argument, and ask him and all unprejudic'd Proteſtants what they can find in all our Doctrines, when truly Repreſented, *to warrant that bitter and unchriſtian hatred they have conceiv'd againſt us*; a hatred which has occaſioned ſo many Penal and Sanguinary Laws; and ſtill makes them uſe all endeavours to keep them in full force againſt us?

Do we not firmly believe the Holy Scriptures according to the Sence and unanimous conſent of the Antient and Primitive Fathers? Do we not embrace the three Creeds, nay, and believe all the fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion?

Do you not acknowledge us to be true Members of the Catholic Church, and by Conſequence your Brethren, tho' you will have us to be unſound and weak?

If we maintain any Doctrines different from yours, do we not ſhew you plain Texts of Scripture for moſt of them; and the conſent of Primitive Fathers, and the acknowledged Practices of the Church for above 1000 Years for every one of them?

Do we not fix our Grounds upon the undoubted Word of God deliver'd down to us either by Writing or uninterrupted Tradition, and explicated by the unanimous conſent of the Paſtors and Teachers in all times and places?

If we tell you a *due Honour* is to be paid to Images purely upon the account of being *Repreſentatives*, and not for themſelves; is it not agreeable to your own Practice who bow to the Altar, keep uncover'd in a Church, bend the Knees at the Name of *JESUS* not for the ſake of the Altar, Fabric, or Sound, but with a reference to the Victim, which Conſecrates the Altar, to God who is in a peculiar manner preſent in the Church, and to *JESUS CHRIST* the Son of God underſtood by that ſound; which Honour, if it may be called Religious in ſome reſpect, it is not manifeſtly becauſe it tends ultimately to God himſelf?

If we deſire the Saints and Angels, who Reign in Heaven to Pray with us, and for us, to their and our Common

Common Creator, and if we acknowledge ſuch Prayers are good and beneficial to aid and help us in our neceſſities; we know no more injury is done to *JESUS CHRIST* our ſole Redeemer by ſuch Addreſſes than by your own to a Parent or a Friend, we deteſt that Religion of Angels mentioned by the Apoſtle, according to that Sence that Col. 2. 18. place manifeſtly bears, and as the Antient Fathers underſtood it; but we think with the ſame Fathers that a due Honour ought to be given them, as to the Meſſengers and Friends of God. And any undue Worſhip, which elevates them above the pitch of our fellow Creatures, we deteſt. What more can any one in reaſon deſire of us? And if we pronounce Anathema's againſt thoſe who deny it to be lawful to make ſuch innocent Addreſſes, or to pay ſuch a due and limited Honour, it is becauſe they contradict Antiquity, and the approved Fathers of the Church.

We acknowledge, 'tis true, a Real Preſence of the Body and Blood of *JESUS CHRIST* under the Species or Appearances of Bread and Wine; and are we not aſſured of it by the very Words of *JESUS CHRIST*, by the manifeſt conſent of Antiquity; by the continual practice of both the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches? If we be ignorant of the manner, at leaſt we are not of the thing: And do's not your Chatechiſm and your moſt Learned Divines acknowledge as much, your Confeſſion of your ignorance of the manner of his being preſent do's not hinder you from acknowledging the *Body and Blood of our Bleſſed Saviour to be verily and indeed taken and receiv'd*, not only by Faith, but *by the Faithful* in the Lords Supper.

This

This Real Preſence is grounded upon the Words of our Bleſſed Saviour, *This is my Body*, taken literally; from whence alſo it neceſſarily follows, that after the words of Conſecration, 'tis no more *Bread* and *Wine*, but the *Body* and *Blood* of *JESUS CHRIST*. This Conſequence of the Real Preſence many Proteſtants themſelves confeſs and acknowledge, that if the words muſt be taken literally they muſt neceſſarily grant both *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Adoration*, and all the reſt of our Doctrines about this Sacrament: And if any one ask us why we take it literally, we may with the Biſhop of *Condom* ſay, they may as well ask us why we keep the High Road; that is, all the Fathers of the Church in all Ages having taken it in that Sence, we ought no more to deviate from it, than from a beaten Road.

If we adore our Bleſſed Saviour in the Sacrament it is but a neceſſary Conſequence of his Real Preſence; and what they who believe him preſent cannot but think themſelves oblig'd to do.

We acknowledge, that where Gods Commands are Poſitive, they are indiſpenſible; and therefore if we judge Communion under both kinds, not to be poſitively Commanded, we judge ſo becauſe the Church in all Ages diſpenſed with it; and you your ſelves grant, that in caſes of neceſſity every Paſtor may give it under one kind only, and is he not left judge when that caſe occurs, and when he may make uſe of it?

Theſe things conſidered, I muſt uſe your own words.

Pag. 84. *Men and Brethren: conſider, we conjure you, theſe things: and if you pleaſe, conſider us too, what we are and what our Manners and Converſation amongſt*

amongſt you has been, even when Perjury and Faction loaded us with all the Injuries Hell it ſelf could invent, and exerciſed their utmoſt ſeverities upon us. What alſo we are at preſent, and how our change of Fortune makes us neither remember former Injuries, nor deſire to revenge them. *Believe us at leaſt, that we have no other ends but Truth, no deſigns but to convince your Judgments* ; and if we dare not be over curious in enquiring into the manner *how* the Myſteries that are revealed can poſſibly be true, 'tis becauſe we know they are revealed, and doubt not of Gods Veracity. Believe us, that we have no other Intereſt but the Salvation of our own Souls, and thoſe of others, by endeavouring to repreſent our Doctrines as they truly are, and ſoliciting the Children of the Church to return to their Mothers Boſome.

We are in poſſeſſion ; the Proofs you bring againſt us are only Negatives and meer Conjectures ; *you think them convincing Arguments*, but are not certain, but that you may fail in your Conjectures.

You cannot ſhew one poſitive Argument againſt the Invocation of Saints either from Scripture, or from Fathers : Not one againſt the Doctrine of the Real Preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, Veneration of Images upon account of their Repreſentations ; not one againſt the number of Sacraments, not one to prove Communion under both kinds to be indiſpenſible, or that Children dying without Baptiſm are ſaved. In a word, you cannot ſhew one poſitive Argument againſt any one Doctrine of our Church if you ſtate it right : All you can ſay, is, it do's not appear to us out of Scripture, it do's not appear to us from Antiquity ; ſhew us, you ſay, your Authen-

tic Records, your Deeds of Gift, your Revelation and we will believe; as if an uninterrupted poſſeſſion were not ſufficient Proof.

Our Plea is good, *olim poſſidio prior poſſidio.* If you will diſpute our Title, you muſt ſhew your poſitive Records of a more Antient Date. But what need of ſo much bitterneſs whilſt you plead your Cauſe? Is it not enough to diſpoſſeſs us, but all the rigours imaginable muſt be inflicted, and when Power is wanting muſt the Pen and Tongue be exerciſed, in painting us as the moſt hideous Monſters for the Rabble to devour.

If we be ſilent, we ſhamefully give up the Cauſe: If we ſpeak and ſhew our Doctrines in their true and native dreſs, we are repreſented to be New Reformers, *Palliating* or *Prevaricating* our Doctrines. And tho' we deteſt all Diſſimulation in any caſe, much more in matters of Religion; yet even in that we muſt be repreſented as Diſſemblers; who make neither Conſcience of Lying, Impoſing, Forging, nor any other Villany to ſupport our Cauſe: Is this Juſtice? is this Brotherly Charity? is this Chriſtianity?

We declare this is our Doctrine: They who are bred up in it acknowledge it as ſuch; they whoſe Conſciences made them forſake their former Errours, and embrace the Catholic Faith (of which I my ſelf, I bleſs God am one) after all ſtrict enquiry find it to be ſuch: They who are newly converted daily exclaim againſt their being formerly deceiv'd, and find this Doctrine as here repreſented to be that, and only that which is required of them to believe, in order to their being Members of Our Church. Nay, even they who are the fierceſt

againſt

againſt us are deſir'd to try the Experience themſelves, and ſee whether upon the profeſſion of theſe Truths, they will not be admitted to our Communion. What can we ſay or do more, to make our ſelves be believ'd? We who refuſe to take thoſe Oaths which thwart our Conſcience tho' we loſe all our Temporal advantage by the refuſal, are yet ready to take any Oaths that this is our Doctrine; But yet we muſt not be believ'd! And ſhall not a ſtrict account be one day given for all theſe Scandals unjuſtly thrown upon us?

Lay not, O God, theſe Sins to their charge, but open the Eyes of all the People of this Nation, that they may ſee thy Truth and embrace it, to the eternal good and comfort of their Souls. Amen.

A Copy of the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s Letter.

✠

A Meaux. 6. Auril 1686.

Mon Reverend Pere.

IL ne ſera pas difficile de repondre a voſtre lettre du 3, ni de ſatisfaire aux objections de fait qu'on vous envoye d'Angleterre contre mon Expoſition de la Doctrine Catholique. Le Miniſtre Anglois qui l'a refutée & dont vous m'enuoyez les objections n'a fait que ramaſſer des Contes que nos Huguenots ont voulu debiter ici, & qui ſont tombez d'eux mêmes, ſans que j'äye eu beſoin de me donner la peine de les combattre.

Cet Auteur dit premierement que la Sorbonne n'a pas voulu donner ſon Approbation a mon Liure. Mais tout le monde ſcait ici que je n'ai jamais ſeulement ſongé a la demander. La Sorbonné n'a pas accoutumè d'approuver des Liures en corps : Quand elle en approuveroit je n'aurois eu aucun beſoin de ſon Approbation ayant celle de tant d'Euêques & étant Euêque moymême. Cette Venerable Compaignie, ſcait trop ce qu'elle doit aux Euêques qui ſont naturellement & par leur carractere les urais Docteurs de l'Egliſe pour croire qu'ils ayent beſoin de l'approbation de ſes Docteurs. Joint que la pluſpart des Euêques qui ont approuvé mon liure ſont du corps de la Sorbonne, & moymême je tiens a honneur d'en eſtre auſſi. Céſt une grand foibleſſe, de me demandre que j'aye a produire l'appobation de la Sorbonne pendant qu'on voit dans mon liure celle de tant de ſcavants Euêques, celle de tout le Clergé de France *dans l'aſſemblée de* 1682. *& celle du Pape même. Vous*

Vous voyez par la, mon Reverend Pere, que c'eſt une fauſſeté toute viſible de dire qu'on ait ſupprimé la premiere Edition de mon Liure de peur que les Docteurs de Sorbonne n'y trouvaſſent a redire. Je n'én ai jamais publié ni fait faire d'Edition que celle qui eſt entre les mains de tout le monde ; a laquelle je n'ai jamais ni oſté ni dimiuüé une ſyllabe : & je n'ai jamais apprehendé qu'aucun Docteur Catholique y puſt rien reprendre.

Voila ce qui regarde la premiere objection de l'Auteur Anglois. Pour ce qu'il ajoûte en ſecond lieu qu'un Catholique, dont il deſigne le Nom par une lettre capitale, avoit ecrit contre moy ; quand cela ſeroit, ce ſeroit tant pis pour ce mauvais Catholique. Mais c'eſt, comme le reſte, un conte fait a plaiſir : C'eſt en vain que nos Huguenots l'ont voulu debiter ici : Jamais perſonne n'a oiü parler de ce Catholique : ils ne l'ont jamais pû nommer & tout le monde c'eſt moqué d'eux.

En troiſiéme lieu on dit que le Pere Craſſet *Jeſuite a combattu ma Doctrine dans un liure intitulé* la veritable devotion envers la Sainte Vierge. *Je n'ai pas lû ce liure ; mais je n'ai jamais oiü dire qu'il y eut rien contre moy, & ce Pere ſeroit bien fachè que je le crûſſe.*

Pour le Cardinal Capiſucchi *loin d'ètre contraire a la Doctrine que i'ai enſeignée on trouvera, ſon Approbation expreſſe parmi celles que jay rapportées dans l'edition de l'Expoſition de l'an* 1676. *Et c'eſt luy qui comme Maitre du ſacré Palais permit l'an* 1675. *l'impreſſion qui ſe sît alors a la Congregation* de propaganda fide, *de la verſion Italienne de ce liure. Voila ceux que les Aduerſaires penſent m'oppoſer.*

Quant a ce Monſieur Imbert *& a Monſieur le Paſteur de Sainte* Marie de Malines *qu'on pretend avoir eſté condamnez, encore qu'ils alleguaſſent mon Expoſition pour guarend de leur Doctrine ; c'eſt a ſcavoir s'ils l'alleguoient*

leguoient a tort ou a droit; Et des faits avancez en l'air ne meritent pas qu'on s'en informe davantage.

Mais puiſqu'on deſire d'en eſtre informé, je vous dirai que cet Imbert *eſt un homme ſans nom comme ſans ſcavoir, qui crût juſtifier ſes extravagances devant Monſieur l'Archeuêque de* Bordeaux *ſon Superieur en nommant mon Expoſition a ce Prelat qui en a ſouſcrit l'approbation dans l'aſſemble de* 1682. *Mais tout le monde vît bien que le Ciel n'eſt pas plus loin de la terre, que ma Doctrine l'etoit de ce qui avoit auancè cet Emporté. Au reſte jamais Catholique n'a ſongé qu'il, fallût rendre a la Croix le même honneur qu'on rend a J. C. dans l'Euchariſtie, ni que la Croix auec J. C. duſt eſtre adorée de la même maniere que la nature humaine auec la Divine en la perſonne du Fils de Dieu. Et quand cet homme ſe vante d'eſtre condamné pour auoir nié ces Erreurs que perſonne ne ſoûtint jamais, il montre autant de malice que d'ignorance.*

Pour le Paſteur de Sainte Marie de Malines *qu'on dit eſtre un homme de merite, j'ai vû un petit imprimé de luy intitulé,* motivum juris: *ou il auance que le Pape eſt dans l'Egliſe ce que le Preſident eſt dans un Conſeil & le premier* Eſcheuin *ou le* Bourgmeſtre, *comme on l'appelle dans les Paysbas, dans la compaignie des Echeuins; Choſe tres eloignée de l'Expoſition, ou je reconnois le Pape comme un Chef établi de Dieu, a qui on doit ſoumiſſion & obeiſſance. Si donc la Faculté de Louvain a cenſuré cet ecrit, je ne prends point de part dans cette diſpute, & d'ailleurs mon Expoſition eſt ſi peu rejettée dans les Paysbas qu'au contraire elle y parôit, imprimée a Anuers en langue Flamande auec toutes les marques de l'autorité publique tant Eccleſiaſtique que Seculiere.*

Pour ces pretendus paſſages qu'on pretend que j'ai corrigez dans une ſeconde Edition de peur de fâcher la Sorbonne,

Sorbonne, c'eſt, comme vous voyez, un conte en l'air, & je repete que je n'ai ni publié, ni auoüé, ni fait faire aucune edition de mon ouurage que celle que l'on connôit, ou ie n'ai jamais rien changé.

Il eſt urai que comme ce petit Traité fût donné dabord ecrit a la main pour ſeruir a l'inſtruction de quelques perſonnes particulieres, & qu'il s'en repandit pluſieurs copies, on le fit imprimer ſans ordre & ſans ma participation. Perſonne n'en improuva la Doctrine & moymême, ſans y rien changer que quelques choſes de nulle importance, ſeulement pour l'ordre & pour une plus grande netteté du diſcours & du ſtyle, je le fis imprimer comme on l'a vû. Si la deſſus on veut croire que jaie eſté en quelque ſorte contraire a moymême, c'eſt eſtre de trop facile croyance.

Mais quand ainſi ſeroit, & que pour mettre mon ouurage hors de toute atteinte je me ſerois en quelques endroits corrigé moymême, ce que, Dieu merci, je n'ai pas eu beſion de faire; tant s'en faut qu'on en eût dêu moins eſtimer l'ouurage, qu'au contraire ce ſeroit une preuve que je ſerois venu a bout de le mettre en ſi bon état, que ni la Sorbonne, ni qui que ce ſoit n'y pût rien trouver a redire comme en effet aucun Catholique n'y reprend rien.

La derniere objection que me fait le Miniſtre Anglois c'eſt que je ſuis aſſez fertile a faire des nouueaux liures; mais que je ne reponds pas a ce qu'on écrit contre mes ouurages: d'ou il conclut que je reconnois qu'on ne peut pas les deffendre. Il eſt urai que j'ai fait trois petits Traitez de Controverſe dont l'un eſt celuy de l'Expoſition. Sur celuyla, comme on objectoit principalement que j'avois adouci & deguisé la Doctrine Catholique, la meilleure reponſe que je pouuois faire étoit de rapporter les Approbations qui me venoient naturellement de tous les coſtez

costez de l'Europe, & celle du Pape même reiterée par deux fois : Cette reponse est sans repartie, & j'ai dit ce qu'il falloit sur ce sujet la, dans un Auertissement que j'ai mis a la teste de l'Edition de 1676.

Si le Pere qui vous a enuoyé les objections du Ministre Anglois, n'a pas connoissance de cet Auertissement, je vous prie de le prendre chez Cramoisy en vertu de l'ordre que vous trouuerez dans ce paquét & de l'enuoyer a ce Pere comme il a este imprimé en 1686. *Parceque j'ai ajouté dans cette Edition l'approbation du Clergé de* France *& une seconde Approbation tres Authentique du Pape.*

Que si le Pere veut prendre la peine de joindre a la Traduction de l'Exposition celle de cet Avertissement & des Approbations qui y sont jointes, il rendra son travail plus profitable au public, & il fermera la bouche aux contredisants.

Quant aux deux autres petits Traitez que j'ai composé sur la Controverse, l'un est sur la Communion sous les deux especes : Et l'autre c'est ma Conference auec Monsieur Claude *Ministre de Charenton, sur l'autorité de l'Egiise, auec des reflections sur les reponses de ce Ministre. Dans ces Traitez je tache de preuoir les objections principales, & d'y donner des reponses, dont les gents sensez soint contents. Apres cela, de multiplier les disputes & de composer liures sur liures, pour embroüiller les questions & en faire perdre la piste, ni la charité ne me le demande, ni mes occupations ne me le permettent.*

Vous pouvez enuoyer cette lettre en Angleterre. Le R. Pere qui a desiré ces eclaircissements en prendra ce-qu'il trouvera convenable. S'il trouve qu'il soit utile de dire qu'il a appris de moymême ce qui regarde ces faits & mes intentions, il le peut : & il peut aussi asseurer

sans

ſans crainte qu'il ny a rien qui ne ſoit public & certain. Jeluy ſuis tres obligé de ſes trauaux, s'il deſire quelqu'autre choſe de moy je le ferai auec joye, &c.

Mon Reuerend Pere,

Voſtre bien humble & tres

Affectionè Serviteur.

✠ J. Benigne E. de Meaux.

A

POST-SCRIPT

To the Author or Authors of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England, &c.*

I Doubt not but this Vindication will have the ſame fate with others of this nature; that is, it will not be long before ſome kind of Anſwer will be made to it; for nothing can be ſo clearly expreſs'd or ſo firmly eſtabliſh'd, but that a Perſon, who intends to Cavil, may either form a ſeeming Objection againſt it, or wreſt it into a different ſence. But for my part, becauſe I would not have the unbyaſs'd Readers, who are deſirous to examine Truth, amus'd in the ſearch of it, nor have ſuch things put into their Hands as anſwer not their Expectations, but leave them to repent their ill ſpent Money and their Time; therefore I would deſire there might be ſuch a right underſtanding of the Caſe, ſuch fair dealing, and ſuch ſincerity uſed amongſt us, that the World might be convinc'd we contend not for Victory but for Truth. In order to which the beſt Method will certainly be to keep cloſe to the Point in Queſtion, which is whether the Biſhop of *Condom* has truly repreſented the Doctrine of the *Roman* Catholic Church, without either Palliating or Perverting it.

I ſay,

I ſay, the Doctrine of the Church; for we have nothing here to do with the Doctrine of the Schools. Seeing therefore the Biſhop of *Condom* profeſſes to conform himſelf to the Doctrine of the Church as delivered in the Council of *Trent*, to which all Catholics do ſubmit; They who will oppoſe his Expoſition muſt (if they will bring any ſolid Arguments againſt him) ſhew he has corrupted that Council, and given us a Doctrine which is neither conformable to that of this Council, nor conſiſtent with ſome other Public, Authentic and Univerſally receiv'd Definitions and Deciſions of the whole Church. If any thing of this nature be produc'd, I promiſe an Ingenuous return ſhall be made, without the leaſt Cavil or reflecting Language. To avoid which I have one thing earneſtly to beg of you, that before you publiſh any thing of this nature, you would be pleas'd to take the pains your ſelves to peruſe the Authors cited by you, and not to Tranſcribe Quotations, nor take up things by hear-ſay. You cannot be ignorant but it has ofen been objected to Proteſtant Writers by us, that they are faulty in this, and ſubject to great miſtakes, if not wilful Prevarications. I hope therefore you will hereafter conſult at leaſt your Reputations (if the ſearch after Truth be not a ſufficient motive) and take nothing from any of them without a ſerious examination of the Sence of the Authors quoted by them, and a ſincere Application of it to the Point in Queſtion. If you pleaſe to take that *neceſſary Advice* along with you *for profitably reading Books of Controverſie extracted out of* Walſingham's *ſearch into matters of Religion*, Part 3. c. 10. Printed at the end of the Second Edition of the *Complaint of*

the French Clergy, and follow it preciſely, I hope you your ſelves will one Day ſee the Truth, and to the Glory of God profeſs it. However this benefit will come by it, that you will ſave others the pains of examining ſo many different Authors; that you will remove that juſt occaſion which is now given of cenſuring your Religion, as not maintainable without ſuch ſiniſter doings; and laſtly, you will free me from that troubleſome and ungentile Office of demonſtrating to the World that unſincerity which you have ſhewn in your Quotations, the falſifications of which I would not have taken notice of in this, had not Truth and Religion been at Stake.

FINIS.

THE

CONTENTS.

PART I. *Containing an Answer to the Preface.* Pag. 1

PART II. Art. 1. *Introduction.* 22

Art. 2. *Religious Worship is terminated in God only.* 27

Art. 3. *Invocation of Saints.* 29

Art. 4. *Images and Relics.* 31

Art. 5. *Of Justification.* 46

Art. 6. *Of Merits.* 48

Art. 7. *Satisfactions, Purgatory and Indulgences.* 54

Art. 8. *Of the Sacraments in general.* 59

Art. 9. *Of Baptism.* 61

Art. 10. *Of Confirmation.* 63

Art. 11. *Of Penance and Confession.* 64

Art. 12. *Of Extream Unction.* 68

Art. 13. *Of Marriage.* 70

Art. 14. *Of Holy Orders.* 71

Art. 15. *Of the Eucharist.* 72

Art. 16. *Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.* 94

Art. 17. *Of the Epistle to the* Hebrews. 96

Art. 18. *Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.* 97

Art. 19. *Communion under both Species.* 98

Art. 20. *Of the written and unwritten Word.* 100

Art. 21. *Of the Authority of the Church.* 101

Art. 22. *Authority of the Holy See, and of Episcopacy.* 106

The Conclusion. Ibid.

A Catalogue of Books Printed for *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's moſt Excellent Majeſty, for his Houſhold and Chappel, 1686. And are to be Sold next door to his Houſe in *Black-fryers*, at *Richard Cheeſe*'s.

REflections upon the Anſwer to the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented &c.* Directed to the Anſwerer. *Quarto.*

Kalendarium Catholicum for the Year 1686. *Octavo.*

Papiſts Proteſting againſt *Proteſtant-Popery.* In Anſwer to a Diſcourſe Entituled, *A Papiſt not Miſ-repreſented by Proteſtants.* Being a Vindication of the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented* and *Repreſented*, and the *Reflections* upon the Anſwer. *Quart.*

Copies of Two Papers Written by the late King *Charles* II. Together with a Paper Written by the late Dutcheſs of *York.* Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Folio.*

The Spirit of Chriſtianity. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Twelves.*

The firſt Sermon Preach'd before their Majeſties in *Engliſh* at *Windſor*, on the firſt *Sunday* of *October* 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. P. E.* Monk of the Holy Order of S. *Benedict*, and of the *Engliſh* Congregation. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Quarto.*

Second Sermon Preached before the King and Queen, and Queen Dowager, at Their Majeſties Chappel at St *James's*, *November* 1, 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. Ph. Ellis*, Monk of the Holy Order of S. *Benedict*, and of the *Engliſh* Congregation. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Quarto.*

The

The Third Sermon Preach'd before the King and Queen, in their Majesties Chappel at St. *James's*, on the third *Sunday* in *Advent*, *Decemb.* 13. 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. Ph. Ellis*, Monk of the Holy Order of St. *Benedict*, and of the *English* Congr. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. Published by His Majesties Command. *Quarto.*

Sixth Sermon Preach'd before the King and Queen, in their Majesties Chappel at St. *James's*, upon the first *Wednesday* in *Lent*, Febr. 24. 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. Ph. Ellis*, Monk of the Holy Order of St. *Benedict*, and of the *English* Congregation. Publish'd by his Majesty's Command. *Quarto.*

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controversie. By the Right Reverend *James Benigne Bossuet*, Counsellor to the King, Bishop of *Meaux*, formerly of *Condom*, and Preceptor to the *Dauphin*: First Almoner to the *Dauphiness*. Done into *English* with all the former Approbations, and others newly published in the Ninth and Last Edition of the *French*. Published by His Majesties Command. *Quarto.*

A Sermon preach'd before the King and Queen, in Their Majesties Chappel at St. *James's*, upon the *Annunciation* of our Blessed Lady, *March* 25. 1686. By *Jo. Betham* Doctor of *Sorbon*. Published by His Majesties Command. *Quarto.*

An Abstract of the *Douay Catechism*, for the Use of Children and Ignorant People. Now Revis'd and much amended. Publish'd with Allowance. *Twentyfours.*

A Pastoral Letter from the Lord Bishop of *Meaux*, to the New Catholics of His Dioceſs, Exhorting them to keep their *Easter*, and giving them neeessary Advertisements against the *False Pastoral Letters* of their *Ministers*. With Reflections upon the Pretended Persecution. Translated out of *French*, and Publish'd with Allowance. *Quarto.*

The Answer of the *New Converts* of *France*, to a *Pastoral Letter* from a *Protestant* Minister. Done out of *French*, and Publish'd with Allowance. *Quarto.*

The

The Ceremonies for the Healing of them that be Diseased with the Kings Evil, used in the time of King *Henry* VII. Published by His Majesties Command. *Quarto* in Latin, *Twelves* in English.

A Short Christian Doctrine. Composed by the R. Father *Robert Bellarmin*, of the Society of *Jesus*, and Cardinal. Published with Allowance. *Twelves*

ERRATA.

PAge 8. l. 15. dele *to*. p. 10. l. 23. r. *Are the men*. p. 22. l. 18. r. *Misrepresentations*. p. 98. l. 14. r. *Efforts*. p. 108. l. 31. r. *is it not*.

287566